# Lutheran World

PUBLICATION OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

DECEMBER
1956
Vol. III, No. 3

TRADITION IN CONFESSIONAL LUTHERANISM

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

LUTHERAN EXPECTATIONS AND HOPES
IN REGARD TO CATHOLICS PETER BRUNNER

BASIL OF CAESAREA AND THE DOGMA
OF THE HOLY SPIRIT HERMANN DORRIES

THE CHURCH AND THE BREAK-THROUGH
OF THE ESCHATA
RUDOLF STÄHLIN

# CONTENTS

Jaroslaw Pelikan: Tradition in Confessional Lutheranism
Peter Brunner: Lutheran Expectations and Hopes in regard to Catholics
Hermann Dörries: Basil of Caesarea and the Dogma of the Holy Spirit
Rudolf Stählin: The Church and the Break-through of the Eschata
FROM THE WORK OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION AND THE ECUMENICAL WORLD
World Mission
A New Look at Policy (Fredrik A. Schiotz)
Missions Statistics for World Lutheranism (Arne Sovik)
Statistics for the Younger Churches (Arne Sovik)
Theology
When Books become Men (Ernst Kähler)
Theological Education in India (Vilmos Vajta)
World Service
Open Doors and Major Decisions (A. Jean Olson)
FROM LANDS AND CHURCHES
India Missionary Work in India (J. D. Asirvadam)
The United States Religion and the Industrial World (Theo J. Pretzlaff)
Czechoslovakia
The Lutheran Confessions in Translation (Otto Vizner)
France
The Present Theological Situation (Th. Suss)
Germany
Sunday School Work of the Churches in Exile (Laimons Pavuls)
CORRESPONDENCE
CORRESPONDENCE
BOOK REVIEWS
The Foundations of Dogmatics
Pauline Theology
A Lutheran Theology of Awakening
Luther's Exegesis
The Church in Asia
In Place of Geneva Diary (Hans Bolewski)
Editorial Notes

### LUTHERAN WORLD

PUBLICATION OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

Vol. III, No. 3

December 1956

#### VENI CREATOR SPIRITUS

Veni, Creator Spiritus, Mentes tuorum visita, Imple superna gratia, Quae tu creasti pectora.

Qui diceris Paraclitus, Donum Dei altissimi, Fons vivus, ingnis, caritas, Et spiritalis unctio.

Tu septiformis munere, Dextrae Dei tu digitus, Tu rite promissum Patris, Sermone ditans guttura.

Accende lumen sensibus, Infunde amorem cordibus: Infirma nostri corporis Virtute firmans perpeti.

Hostem repellas longius, Pacemque dones protinus: Ductore sic te praevio Vitemus omne noxium.

Per te sciamus da Patrem, Noscamus atque Filium, Te utriusque Spiritum Credamus omni tempore.

Gloria Patri Domino, Natoque, qui a mortuis Surrexit, ac Paraclito, In saeculorum saecula.

#### IAROSLAV PELIKAN

## Tradition in Confessional Lutheranism\*

In a series of sermons delivered for the tercentenary of the Augsburg Confession in 1830, Schleiermacher voiced two objections to the polemical and condemnatory clauses of the Confession. On the one hand, it seemed to him that "there were less than adequate grounds for uncritically incorporating into the new confession of faith all the traditional doctrinal definitions and all the terminology of centuries long since past".1 In other words, the Confession was too Catholic and traditional. At the same time, he asked the rhetorical question: "Would it not be presumptuous if we imagined we had found the truth in such a way as to make us perfectly certain, both that no one else could condemn us this same way and that we can gain nothing further from associating with those who think otherwise and whom we condemn?"2 In other words, the Confession was too particular and exclusive. The ambivalence which these two objections reveal helps make it clear how Schleiermacher could discuss the relation of theology and the Church the way he did in The Christian Faith,3 but it also reflects a more fundamental paradox in the Reformation as Luther carried it out and as it was codified in the confessions of his colleagues and pupils, in Melanchthon and in what I have elsewhere termed "the confessional generation". A glance at two such codifications-the Augsburg Confession and the Examen of Martin Chemnitz-will indicate the dual role of tradition in the theology of confessional Lutheranism, suggesting comparisons and contrasts with its role in the thought of the Reformers.

When the Augsburg Confession is examined for evidence of its attitude toward tradition, the dual character of that attitude becomes apparent very quickly. The word traditio is used in the plural to translate Menschensatzungen, "human traditions, instituted to placate God, to merit grace, and to make satisfaction for sins"4; therefore the term has a predominantly pejorative connotation. But if the examination goes beyond a concordance study of the word

<sup>\*</sup>The following is based upon a paper presented to the Theological Commission on Tradition and Tradi-

<sup>\*</sup>Ine rollowing is based upon a paper presented to the Theological Commission on Tradition and Traditions—American Section—of the Commission on Faith and order of the World Council of Churches.

1 Friedrich Schleiermacher, Predigten, VI (Berlin, 1831), 149.

2 Ibid., pp. 160—161. In an earlier sermon he makes the characteristic suggestion that any such condemnatory clause had to be a dead letter "for anyone who could not live through all the controversies upon which the definitions of doctrine rest" (ibid., p. 57).

3 Friedrich Schleiermacher, Der christliche Glaube (6th ed.; Berlin, 1919), I, 139, and the whole of section 27.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Augsburg Confession, XV, 3, Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (2nd ed.; Göttingen, 1952), pp. 69-70.

traditio to a consideration of how the Augsburg Confession treats the received doctrines and practices of the Christian past, the traditionalism of the Confession is its striking feature. It makes it protestations of loyalty to tradition abundant and explicit. One feature of this loyalty was the acceptance of the ancient creeds, which were expressly included in the Book of Concord and cited in the Augustana. Indeed, the ordination formulas of confessional Lutheranism suggest that the Augsburg Confession was viewed as a commentary upon the ecumenical creeds, just as later Lutheran symbols, in turn, were commentaries upon it.<sup>5</sup>

There were, to be sure, good political reasons for affirming the tradition as represented by the Trinitarian and the Christological dogmas, and it would be historically dishonest to ignore these. Viewed politically, the Augsburg Confession is the defense offered by the protesting German estates, princes, and free cities as a validation of their right to reform the churches within their own principalities. This right had been contested by leaders of both Church und Empire, who maintained that by their defection from Rome the Evangelical estates had lost their right to rule. For under the law of the Empire, all nations and rulers were compelled to accept the apostolica disciplina of the Trinitarian tradition as inherited from the ancient Church. A violation of this Trinitarian tradition constituted not merely heresy but sedition, and any ruler who was disloyal to this Catholic tradition could be deposed. To forestall any attempt at deposing the Evangelical princes and estates for their support of Luther, Melanchthon made the Augsburg Confession a demonstration of their continued loyalty to the Catholic tradition despite their defection from Rome. Throughout the history of Augsburg, then, what Hans von Schubert called "Bekenntnisbildung und Religionspolitik" always went together.

But it would be a mistake to emphasize the political element in this loyalty at the expense of the religious and theological, as was fashionable a generation ago. For one thing, the content of the tradition, as the Augustana interprets it, is principally the dogma of the Trinity. Despite his occasional aspersions upon Trinitarian terminology, Luther's theology was more explicitly grounded in the doctrine of the Trinity than that of many among his predecessors. In addition, the declaration of loyalty to the tradition was important to the confessors because they still clung to the ideal of one religion in one state. Therefore they tried to interpret the conflict as a contention between two parties in a single church, rather than as a conflict between churches. In keeping with this desire to "accept and maintain a single true religion among all of us, and as we have our being and do our battling under one Christ, to live in one fellowship, church, and unity", they saw in the tradition both a symbol of the

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Otto Ritschl, Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus, I (Leipzig, 1908), 380–389.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Cf. Regin Prenter, Spiritus Creator, tr. by John M. Jensen (Philadelphia, 1953), pp. 173-184.
<sup>7</sup> "Preface" to Augsburg Confession, Bekenntnisschriften, pp. 44-45, a direct quotation from their summons.

existing unity and a means for restoring the lost unity. What they designated by the pejorative traditio, then, was not the credal and liturgical development of Christendom, especially of ancient Christendom, but "the notion which maintains that they justify", 8 that is, the use of traditions as human law rather than as testimony to the divine Gospel.

A symbol of the existing unity and a means for restoring the lost unity were also the repeated damnamus-clauses of the Confession, which afford an interesting insight into the attitude toward tradition underlying the Augustana. These clauses had a twofold purpose: to disavow any affinity with the heresies condemned by the tradition, and to point out features of the Roman position that were a betrayal of the tradition. Thus the first and the nineteenth articles of the Augustana condemned the Manichaean heresy, apparently because the interpretation of God's relation to evil espoused in The Bondage of the Will had been accused of Manichaean tendencies.9 Even more significant are the condemnations of heresy which explicitly refer to the matter of Church and tradition. From the past, it was Donatism which Roman polemics claimed to find reincarnate in the Reformation; from the present, critics were trying to interpret Anabaptism as the logical and consistent outcome of Luther's work. 10 The Augustana condemned "the Donatists and all others"11 like them and thus affirmed the correctness of the tradition by which they were condemned; and it repeatedly dissociated itself from Anabaptism12, not only because of the political implications of the question, but because its attitude toward the tradition and that of the Anabaptists were fundamentally different. It refused to be identified with those movements, past and present, which accepted the identification of Roman and traditional and then proceeded to reject both. Rather, the Augustana sought to root its protest against Rome in the tradition.

The conclusion of the Confession therefore made the claim that "in our circles nothing has been accepted in doctrine or in ceremonies that is opposed to Scripture or the Catholic Church, since it is evident that we have been most careful to keep new and wicked dogmas from creeping into our churches". 13 And in the conclusion to its first part the Confession even claimed to contain "nothing that departs either from the Scriptures or from the Catholic Church or from the Roman Church, insofar as this is known to us from its writers".14 Both these claims were an effort to drive a wedge between Rome and the tradition, or between the Rome of the tradition and the Rome of Eck and Cochlaeus. That effort helps to account for the conservatism of the Confession in both form and content. More than most documents from the Reformation, the Augustana merits Gibbon's epigram that the modern observer

Apology, XV, 38, Bekenntnisschriften, p. 304.
 Cf. Hugo Lämmer, Die vortridentinisch-katholische Theologie (Berlin, 1858), p. 161.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 58, p. 222 on Donatism; on Anabaptism, cf. pp. 229–230.

11 Augsburg Confession, VIII, 3, Bekenntnissdiriften, p. 62.

12 Especially in Article IX, ibid., p. 63.

<sup>13 &</sup>quot;Conclusion", par. 5, ibid., p. 134. 14 "Conclusion" to Art. XXI, par. 2, ibid., p. 83c.

"will rather be surprised at the timidity than scandalized by the freedom of our first Reformers". <sup>15</sup> Thus its statement concerning the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist almost passed the muster of the Roman opponents, and then was reinforced in the strongest of terms by the Apology. <sup>16</sup> This statement is no isolated concession to Roman traditionalism, but part of the growing realization by both Luther and Melanchthon, each in his own way, that the rise of other Protestant movements compelled Lutheranism to declare its loyalty to the Catholic tradition of the West in as unequivocal a statement as possible.

The opening of the second front (actually fronts) made Luther and Melanchthon introduce their entire argumentation with Rome by articulating their position on the pivotal doctrines of the Trinity, original sin, and the person of Christ in such a way as to include the Roman and the Lutheran viewpoints within the unitive formulas of the tradition. Following Luther's lead in earlier articles, the Augustana then sought to articulate its dissent from Rome on the basis of the agreement with tradition stated in the first three articles. Thus Article I stated the Trinitarian faith in traditional, almost austere terminology. Even Carl Stange has had difficulty finding anything in it that is distinctively Lutheran. Interestingly, the table of divine attributes is longer and more abstract in the Latin than in the German text of the Confession; Kierkegaard would certainly suggest that the reason for this is the fact that the Confession antedates Hegel! Some of Luther's statements on the Trinity had been seized by his opponents to prove that he was an Arian, and this article was an affirmation of fidelity to the Trinitarian tradition.

A similar affirmation was expressed in Article II on original sin. Here the Confession appropriated a definition of original sin that seems to be derived from Anselm, who based it upon certain formulations of Augustine. Sin consisted negatively of "a lack of original righteousness" and positively of "concupiscence". To this definition the Confession added a rather conventional condemnation of "the Pelagians and others". As a matter of fact, this definition of original sin did not do justice to the more profound interpretation of human corruption that Luther had developed, and in the Apology Melanchthon was compelled to clarify the point. What was condemned about "the Pelagians and others", moreover, was not what the Pelagians had taught, but what some of the later theologians had been teaching. But taken just as it stands, Article II of the Augustana avoids the entire cleavage between Rome and the Reformers, contenting itself with a traditional formulation of the doctrine. Even in the form in which Rome used it—and much more in the form in which Luther understood it—the traditional Augustinian doctrine constituted an adequate

Edward Gibbon, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Ch. LIV (Modern Library Ed.), II, 890.
 Augsburg Confession, Article X, Bekenntnisschriften, p. 64 and accompanying notes; Apology, Art. X ibid., pp. 247-248.

ibid., pp. 247–248. 17 Carl Stange, "Die Bedeutung des Augsburger Bekenntnisses", Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie, VIII (1931), 590–600. 18 Cf. the references, Bekenntnisschriften, p. 53.

basis for the explanation of justification that was to follow. Not Luther's private ideas, but the "great consensus" of the Evangelical churches on the basis of the tradition was the content of Article II.

After affirming its lovalty to the traditional doctrine of the Trinity and to the Augustinian doctrine of man, the Augustana devoted Article III to the doctrine of Christ. Here its formulation amounts to little more than a paraphrase of the Apostles' Creed, to which its concluding paragraph also makes reference. In this doctrine, especially as regards the work of Christ, Luther had gone beyond the traditional Western interpretation. 19 But except for echoes, there is little of this in Article III, which chose to describe reconciliation in the ancient sacrificial metaphor of Christ as hostia, an image that not only had most of the tradition on its side, but was common to both Luther and the scholastics. Thus Articles I, II, and III of the Augsburg Confession seek to provide a basis in the tradition for the doctrinal conflict between Rome and the Reformers. The dissent from Rome on the doctrine of justification is on this basis. If the Holy Trinity was as holy as the Trinitarian dogma taught; if original sin was as virulent as the Augustinian tradition said it was; and if Christ was as necessary as the Christological dogma implied—then the only way to treat justification in a manner faithful to the best of tradition was to teach justification by faith.

The doctrine of justification by faith thus provided a link between the three great dogmas of the tradition-God, man, and Iesus Christ-and the other points of doctrinal dispute. On some of these points, a large part of the tradition opposed the Reformers. Sometimes it was Rome, sometimes the more radical Protestants, who seemed to have the tradition on their side.20 But by means of this link in the doctrine of justification, Melanchthon proposed to rescue the tradition from itself, to treat questions like the Word, Baptism, civil government, and the power of bishops in a way that was faithful to the doctrine of justification and therefore to what was normative in the tradition. Articles VII and VIII supported the tradition in condemning Donatism, but also declared that it was "not necessary for the true unity of the Christian Church that uniform ceremonies, instituted by men, be observed everywhere."21 The additional phrase "instituted by men" is both an echo of the doctrine of justification and a defense against the charge that the Reformers were eliminating the sacraments from a consideration of what was necessary for the unity of the Church. The sacraments-and here Melanchthon was quite willing to accept traditional ways of defining and even of numbering<sup>22</sup>—were necessary by virtue of their dominical institution. Human ceremonies were not, and it is these ceremonies that are usually meant by the

<sup>19</sup> Philip S. Watson, Let God Be God! (Philadelphia, 1949), pp. 116–132.
20 Johann Oecalampadius' Quid de eucharistia veteres tum Graeci tum Latini senserunt of 1530 had seriously troubled Melanchthon, making him believe that the weight of the ancient tradition favored a spiritualistic interpretation of the Lord's Supper.
21 Augsburg Confession, VII, 4, Bekenntnisschriften, p. 61.
22 Cf. Article XIII of the Apology, ibid., pp. 291–296.

term traditio in the Augustana and the Apology. It was contrary to the heritage (in this sense, tradition) of the Church to call such ceremonies (in this sense, traditions) necessary.

The dual character of the attitude toward tradition that is evident in the Augustana seems to be made possible and necessary by the continuing ideal of one Church and one great tradition, with the conflict over particular traditions going on inside. During the generation that followed the Augustana, several developments combined to discredit that ideal and any attitude toward tradition predicated upon it. The political situation, epitomized by the Smalcaldic War, made its peace with the fact of religious pluralism within the Empire, if not within individual principalities. Lutheranism saw that other Protestant movements had also come to stay, and that it had to define its view of doctrine and tradition in relation to these, not merely in relation to Rome. And Rome itself took actions at Trent that compelled some reappraisal of a position which had been taken when the Roman tradition was undefined.

#### II

The task of restating the Lutheran attitude toward tradition in the face of these developments fell to Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586). Three works come particularly into consideration here: above all, his great Examen of the Council of Trent, published from 1565-1573; his treatise on the two natures in Christ, published in 1571; and his contribution to the Formula of Concord of 1577, especially the Catalog of Testimonies appended to it. A study of the parallels between these last two would cast considerable doubt upon the validity of Otto Ritschl's thesis that the Formula of Concord was a repudiation of Melanchthonian traditionalism.23 Though the preface to the Formula may indeed be a statement of the Sola Scriptura, the actual theological method of the Formula, especially in Article VIII on the person of Christ, would tend to bear out another interpretation. The Formula faced the responsibility of summarizing and defending Luther's teachings, in this case the Christological formulations of his writings against Zwingli. It faced the assignment of refuting the Protestant opposition, in this case the Christology of Calvinism. And it had to resolve conflicts within Lutheranism itself, in this case the debate between Brenz and Chemnitz. Not by Sola Scriptura, but by a formidable patristic apparatus, Chemnitz' Christology dealt with the challenges of Luther, Calvin, and Brenz-though with each in a different way. But that is not our concern here.

<sup>23</sup> Op. cit., pp. 390-403.

24 Wilhelm Pauck, The Heritage of the Reformation (Boston, 1950), p. 109.

Chemnitz was able to handle tradition this way because of his view of tradition, which represented a considerable development beyond the view espoused by Melanchthon. He was compelled to clarify his view not primarily by any of the stimuli just described, but by the Council of Trent, against which he wrote his *Examen*. Wilhelm Pauck has said of this book:

With great thoroughness and an impressive display of learning in historical theology and without any of the passionate hatred and intemperance that had characterized the polemics of the Reformation age, he endeavored to prove that the Roman Catholic doctrine was against Scripture and the teachings of the ancient Fathers. It was his major purpose to demonstrate that not Protestantism but Roman Catholicism could justly be accused of having fallen away from the teachings and practices of the ancient church... Translated into German and French and frequently republished, even in the nineteenth century, it remained the most useful Protestant criticism of the Council of Trent.<sup>24</sup>

Chemnitz' view of tradition, as defined in the Examen, went beyond Melanchthon's by including in the term "tradition" much of what Melanchthon had said, in the Apology and elsewhere, under other rubrics.

There are, according to Chemnitz, eight different senses in which the word "tradition" may be used in theology. For each sense he provides an abundance of patristic and sometimes scholastic passages. Maintaining that the Roman position was based upon a confusion of the various senses of the word, Chemnitz declared that "this dispute about traditions cannot be more simply explained nor can a reply be more easily put to the quotations from the fathers which the papists set forth at great length in the dispute than by a distinction." The eight senses of the word *traditio* that Chemnitz distinguishes are these: 20

- Those things which Christ and the apostles handed down in a living voice and which the evangelists and the apostles subsequently reduced to writing are often called traditio.
- 2. Without any temporal interruption and in a certain connected succession, the books of Sacred Scripture were cared for by the Church, faithfully transmitted to subsequent generations, and handed down [traditi] to us as though by hand.

3. Irenaeus and Tertullian...celebrate the apostolic tradition...[and] recite almost verbatim those articles of faith which are today contained in the symbol known as

the apostles'.

- 4. Undoubtedly the primitive Church received from the apostles and from apostolic men not only the text of Scripture, but also its legitimate and proper interpretation, which the primitive Church preserved without corruption.
- 5. What the fathers sometimes call those dogmas not set down in Scripture in so many words, but drawn from clear passages of Scripture by good, sure, firm, and clear reasoning.
- 6. The catholic consensus of the fathers.
- 7. The ancient rites and customs which, because of their antiquity, were referred to the apostles.
- 8. The Council of Trent attributes to unwritten traditions pertaining to both faith and morals a right to the same reverence and piety as Sacred Scripture itself.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Martin Chemnitz, Examen Concilii Tridentini. ed. by Ed. Preuss (Leipzig, 1915), pp. 69-70.
<sup>26</sup> The eight senses are discussed *ibid.*, pp. 70-99; in the case of each, I have selected that definition or statement which seems to summarize Chemnitz' view.

It was this eighth sence of the word traditio that was most directly involved in the controversy with Rome.

The purpose of this distinction was to avoid being caught in the situation of the earlier Melanchthonian concept of tradition as ritual and ceremony, and to turn the tradition against Trent. In general, Chemnitz accomplished this latter purpose by interpreting Trent against the background of unresolved contradictions in pre-Reformation theology. With his vast learning in patristic and scholastic literature, he was able to show that in condemning the Reformers Trent was also condemning a considerable portion of the very tradition it claimed to be exalting. A consideration of how Chemnitz analyzed the Tridentine formulation of the doctrine of justification may be as good a sample as any of the procedure he employed and the view of tradition underlying it. 27

Existing side by side in pre-Reformation theology were several ways of interpreting the righteousness of God and the act of justificaton. They ranged from strongly moralistic views that seemed to equate justification with moral renewal to ultra-forensic views, which saw justification as a "nude imputation" that seemed possible apart from Christ, by an arbitrary decree of God. Between these extremes were many combinations; and though certain views predominated in late nominalism, it is not possible even there to speak of a single doctrine of justification. The Apology of the Augsburg Confession made the most of this situation. One of the most penetrating discussions in the Apology is its analysis of the several doctrines of justification characteristic of its opponents.28 Among the various theories present in pre-Reformation Western thought, the Reformers also claimed to find the ancestry of their own view, Luther drawing upon Bernard among others for substantiation. But instead of selecting this view or at least leaving it open as a possibility, the Council of Trent seemed to Chemnitz to select the extreme opposite. He repudiated any doctrine of "nude imputation" and sought to root justification in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ rather than in the absolute will of God. This stress upon the "ordered" rather than the "absolute" will of God set Chemnitz apart from many earlier opponents of moralistic teachings about justification.29

By adopting this teaching and by anathematizing Luther's doctrine, Trent seemed to Chemnitz to be condemning not only Luther and the Reformers, but considerable portions of the tradition it purported to defend. For the weight of the tradition was on the side of divine monergism, particulary if the tradition included, as it did for Chemnitz, not merely learned theology, but also "all the prayers of the saints in which they ask to be instructed, illumined, and sanctified by God. By these prayers they acknowledge that they cannot have what they are asking for by their own natural powers."30 With the

The discussion of justification and of justifying faith appears ibid., pp. 144-199.
 Apology, IV, 287-289, Bekenntnisschriften, p. 21; cf. Karl Holl, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, III, Der Westen (Tübingen, 1928), 171ff. 19 Examen, p. 160. 30 Formula of Concord, Solida Declaratio, II, 15, Bekenntnisschriften, p. 877.

weight of such tradition on his side, Chemnitz could accuse Trent of setting the unwritten tradition which it itself had invented against the "true and certain traditions of the apostles."31 Thus he demonstrated the truly traditional and catholic character of the Reformation doctrine, implying that by closing the door to this doctrine Trent was making Rome a sect. Pointing to the antithesis between the Thomistic and the Scotistic views of justification, Hanns Rückert has come to conclusions that support Chemnitz, while Roman Catholic scholars like Eduard Stakemeier tend to see the Tridentine decree on justification as a conciliatory statement. 32 Chemnitz' view of pre-Reformation developments and tradition is similarly left in doubt by present-day historical scholarship.33

An undertone accompanying Chemnitz' entire discussion is the restatement of a motif heard already in the Augsburg Confession and the Apology-the note of poignancy over the growing realization that the division may be permanent. Precisely because the tradition was as multiform as Chemnitz' polemics demonstrated it to be, it would seem necessary to reconsider any attestation of loyalty to that tradition which moves, as Chemnitz' systematic theology did, in the direction of uniformity. It was one thing to conduct the discussion as the Augustana did, when "the usual form of doctrinal expression"34 was so much a given fact that traditio could be used in the narrow and pejorative sense in which the Augustana and the Apology use it. The broadening of the concept by Chemnitz is itself a testimony to the loss of that given fact. Once it had been lost, what was needed was a new sense of history, to replace the polemical sense evident in Chemnitz and the Centuries as well as in their Roman Catholic counterparts, Bellarmin and Caesar Baronius. The sequel to this paper, therefore, should end where the introduction to this paper began; it should deal with Schleiermacher and with the man whom Hirsch<sup>85</sup> regards as Schleiermacher's predecessor in many ways, J. S. Semler. For in the historical thought of Semler, there comes a new sense of history with an extension of the critical attitude of the Reformers toward tradition; and in Schleiermacher there is the effort to repossess the tradition in a basically Protestant way. The ambivalence toward tradition which has been the theme of this paper will be in evidence in those men, too; but by the very nature of the history in which they stood, the ambivalence will assume a different form. and the concept of "tradition" will have a different meaning.

<sup>31</sup> Examen, p. 173.
32 Hanns Rückert, Die Rechtfertigungslehre auf dem tridentinischen Konzil (Bonn, 1925), pp. 134–190, Eduard Stakemeier, "Trienter Lehrentscheidungen und reformatorische Anliegen" in Georg Schreiber (ed.), Das Weltkonzil von Trient (Freiburg, 1951), I, 97–104.
33 Cf. Hermann Lais, Die Gnadenlehre des heiligen Thomas in der Summa contra Gentiles (Munich, 1951), pp. 75–87; Carl Feckes, Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Gabriel Biel (Münster, 1925), pp. 93–138.
34 "Freface" to Apology, par. 11, Bekenntnisschriften, p. 143.
35 Emanuel Hirsch, Geschichte der neueren evangelischen Theologie (Gütersloh, 1949 ff.), IV, 88–89.

# Lutheran Expectations and Hopes in regard to Catholics

When we expect something from someone, we must tell him clearly what it is that we expect from him. Expectations are not intended to impose any law, but are intended to draw attention to the consequences which should follow "of themselves" in the realm of concrete relations if we take seriously the foundation on which our existence rests. We are not obliged to tell others what we hope for from them, but we have the right to remind them of it to comfort, encourage and guide them on the way. Our expectations and our hopes in regard to others are intermingled. And yet there still remains a difference. Our expectations have reference to the near future, to our mutual ties in the days we spend together on earth. But our hopes are more far-reaching in extent. They are related to that future which we shall no longer experience together on earth and which will finally flow into the eternity of God.

In confrontation therefore with members of the Roman Catholic church, it is not our task to speak about *something*, but to speak to *one another*. For this reason I have chosen the literary form of personal address to present the considerations which follow.

Is it possible for me to speak to you? Can we in fact speak to one another at all? Is not the gulf which separates us too wide for our voices to reach one another? Indeed, the gulf which separates us is very wide and very deep. Between you and myself lies the deepest chasm dividing Christianity. All the divided churches confessing the name of our Redeemer are, despite their divisions, assembled in the ecumenical movement for fruitful official conversations which lay responsibilities upon each of them. That is, all but the Roman Catholic church. Official conversations between the Roman Catholic church and the churches of the Reformation, which were still found to be necessary in the sixteenth century, have since lapsed. Officially, the churches to which we belong can no longer talk to each other. But as individual Christians, as individual members of our churches, we should continue untiringly to talk to one another across the gulf which separates us. And just because the Roman Catholic church does not find itself in a position officially to hold face-to-face conversations with the churches of the Reformation on the questions of faith which separate us, it is most important for individuals to endeavor on both sides, in spite of the wide gulf of separation, to keep within earshot and to speak to one another.

<sup>\*</sup> First published in French by the Editions du Cerf, Paris, in a volume of collected essays entitled Catholicisme allemand.

Today I have the privilege of calling across to you. In doing this we discover that we — you and those in whose name I speak — are all confronted by the same situation in the modern world. At this moment I am not thinking principally of our common oppression by the state. Expressly hostile to Christianity, it has, particularly in the last few decades, used its power in various forms and in different countries to obstruct the Christian faith. At the same time we should not forget that it is precisely through such oppression that members of your church and ours have been brought to the very edges of the gulf which separates us and have been taught to call to each other across this gulf.

I am thinking especially of the fact that the spirit of secularization occupies a large place even in our churches. Among us, as among you, there are a large number of apathetic members; some on the point of falling away altogether; and others innumerable who have become estranged from the inner spiritual life of the church. Among us, as among you, the clergy are fighting a constant battle against the tendency of those who have been baptized to fall into a worldly way of life, which degrades their participation in the life of the church to the point of making it a mere decorative accessory to bourgeois life. It is not open apostasy which represents the greatest danger threatening Christianity, but this phenomenon of secularization which, it seems, can hardly be restrained, and which is taking possession of the vital center and the life of the baptized members of the church with the violence of a whirlwind.

It would be easy, therefore, for each of us to conjure up a distorted picture of the other's church, a picture which need by no means be a creation of the imagination, but which has its basis in the realities of every day. We should not close our eyes to these realities, but should so strive that each may see the other's church not as it appears on the surface, but as it is in the depths of its being. When we talk together about what separates and what unites us, then both we and you must, each in his place, take a firm position in this inner realm and from this point speak to each other.

In saying this, I have indicated the first thing which we expect from you as members of the Roman Catholic church. We expect you to experience the inner spiritual life of your church. The times are past in which it was thought that Christians divided in faith could draw near to one another only after deviating from a definite confessional position. Bad Catholics and bad Lutherans will never come to agreement in the truth. It is only to good Catholics and good Lutherans that it will be given to see the Truth which is Christ. The path on which the Christians divided in faith are converging does not pass by the concrete confessional church but runs through this church itself. And just because we are members of the Evangelical Lutheran church we must expect you not to estrange yourselves from the spiritual life of your church, but to grow more deeply into it. Conversions based on indifference are never a means of achieving the unity of the church; they are always to be deplored.

In asking you to lead your life day by day at the very heart of your church, we are convinced that just there, at this spiritual heart, you will be preserved from establishing in the wrong way an absolute claim for your church. I know that on the subject of problems concerning the limits of the church you put forward dogmatic doctrines which differ basically from our convictions and which we cannot accept. But you may allow yourselves to be reminded that even so, according to the dogma of the Roman Catholic church the circle of men who belong in time and eternity to Jesus Christ is fundamentally wider than the circle of men who are members of the Roman Catholic church. We expect you to accept seriously the possibilities offered by the dogmas of your church of recognizing the members of another confession as members of Jesus Christ. We expect you to accept seriously, as a fully valid sacrament, that baptism which conforms to that instituted by Christ, even if this sacrament is administered outside the Roman Catholic church.

Consider further that the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures, the fundamental source of our faith, are also read, studied, explained, heard, believed and loved among those who in the judgment of your church are heretics. And can it really be maintained that it is a matter of secondary importance to you that the Lutheran church too endeavors to do what Christ will have his disciples do in remembrance of him? Is it really possible to maintain that there is no significance for you in the fact that baptized Christians come together regularly to celebrate the Holy Communion outside the Roman Catholic church, outside the authority conferred by an apostolic episcopal succession, when you consider the question whether God can have members of his people on earth outside the Roman Catholic church?

As things stand, you can do no other than be convinced that the Evangelical Lutheran church is a heretical church. As things stand, we cannot expect you to give up this judgment, but we expect you not to deny to the person whom you are obliged to regard as a heretic the possibility of eternal salvation. We at any rate are convinced that the power of the Lord Jesus Christ is at work through certain means of his grace even where false doctrines destroy or obscure other means of his grace. Admittedly we can do nothing else than pronounce anathema against each other in regard to the doctrines which separate us. We have no intention of weakening the force of this anathema. But neither do we intend to let ourselves be so overwhelmed by it as to forget or to deny the triumphant power of Jesus Christ which transcends all the boundaries set up by the churches.

It may seem to some people a small thing that we should expect the members of the Roman Catholic church in the *judicium caritatis* to consider us Lutherans too as people saved in Christ for eternal blessedness, when we preserve our baptism in faith and live in the word of the apostles. But it is here that the question is decided as to whether we can speak to each other at all, whether in the Roman Catholic church the church entirely takes the place of God, or

whether even in the doctrine of the church the fact is recognized that God in Christ alone is Lord. Here the question is decided as to whether we are going to confine the lordship of Jesus Christ to the ecclesiastical boundaries of our own confession or whether we acknowledge that these boundaries can be relativized by him who, with certain means of his grace, victoriously manifests his lordship even where, according to our conviction, false doctrines attack his honor and make the way of salvation uncertain, ambiguous and dangerous for men.

By expecting that a glance directed towards the sovereign and victorious power of Jesus Christ will place you in a position to see even in the members of a heretical church brothers in Christ on the way to eternal salvation, we speak to you in words full of joy and comfort. In the same way that God is greater than our hearts, the Kingdom of God also is greater than any one of the divided churches to which we belong. But it is precisely when this consoling prospect of the wide extent of the Kingdom of God is opened up before us that we are gripped by fresh pain and suffering. It is when we are convinced that members of Christ belonging to divided churches are making their way in faith and hope towards the Kingdom of God that the question, "Why are we divided?" must weigh heavily upon our hearts. Indeed, those who are united in God as members of Christ ought at the same time to be united here on earth in the communion of the body and blood of Christ before the same altar. But what ought to be is in fact impossible.

This impossibility is not due to ill-will which when enlightened could easily be corrected. Nor is this impossibility due in the last resort to the repercussions of past historical events, which, if one really penetrated into their disastrous consequences, could be revised by means of a new agreement. This impossibility is based on the fact that Christianity in the west has been broken asunder in the struggle concerning the truth of Christ. For the human judgment of the historian and the human judgment of the dogmatician, this rupture is final. Our cautious and well-balanced judgment cannot see how this rupture can ever be healed in the course of earthly history. We expect you not to close your eyes to this critical situation in which Christianity finds itself. We expect you to enter with body and soul into this puzzling darkness from which there is no escape. We expect you to take into your life something of that darkness of the crucifixion which envelops Calvary, bearing in your heart the cross, the suffering, the open wound of the historical and dogmatic finality of the split which tears Christianity asunder. We expect you to abandon all the continued nostalgia in regard to the reunification of divided Christianity. We expect, we hope that you will be found in the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ and that in this fellowship you will also bear the burden of the dividedness of Christianity.

Perhaps for the mutual relationships of our divided churches it is just this point which is most decisive. If we let our suffering in regard to the division of Christianity be brought into the fellowship of the cross of Christ, then we must

radically renounce any attempt on the part of either one of our churches to expand itself or gain a position of sole domination by means of the political power of church or state. We do not expect you to stop praying that those whom you are obliged to regard as heretics may be enlightened and may rediscover the path to truth. We do not expect you to stop telling us why, according to your conviction, we are following the wrong path and are blinded by error. We do not expect you to stop asking us to consider whether the truth of Jesus Christ is not uniquely to be found in the successor of St. Peter in Rome. But we do expect you to resist in questions of faith every attempt to exercise pressure by means of secular power. If in the fellowship with Christ you bear along with him the cross of the division of Christendom, you can no longer sanction the fact that in the sphere of public state affairs people are discriminated against for not belonging to the Roman Catholic church. You recall the situation of the Protestants in Spain! You will no longer be able to sanction the fact that the Roman Catholic church resorts to the power of the state in order to encroach upon or to remove altogether the legal bases of a church of the Reformation.

The idea of tolerance has had a curiously confused history in which the most diverse tendencies have intermingled. We do not expect you to profess an obsolete form of tolerance. But we do expect you to acknowledge that from the fact of Christian suffering deriving from the division of Christendom there arises — if I may put it thus — a truly spiritual patience and tolerance, begotten of the Holy Spirit, in respect to the man of a different faith. He confronts you with his different faith as one imposing on you the cross of Christ, in order that you may willingly accept and bear it. This discipleship of the cross of Christ is not compatible with the use of power politics in coming to terms with the man whose faith is different. Whatever may be the divine meaning of the historical and dogmatic finality which characterizes the split in western Christianity, it is certain that all the churches must lay the temporal sword aside - finally and totally - and must expect the victory of truth only through the free proclamation of the Word. We do not know what God's eyes see when piercing the darkness of the division of his people. For us it is impenetrable. But it is certain that we should learn according to his will, in spite of divergences of faith, to live in the same community, united under the same law, in true humanity one with the other. We expect of you that you should never forget what we have had to learn through painful experiences in the course of centuries. We expect you to prove these insights afresh and in a deeper sense wherever they have not yet penetrated or are in danger of being forgotten.

We do not expect that where this spiritual idea of tolerance determines our mutual relations all tensions in the political and cultural sphere will disappear all at once. We do not expect that in problems concerning the form of our public and cultural relations we shall always arrive at identical results or that in practice we shall adopt the same methods. But we do expect this spiritual

tolerance which we mutually acknowledge to produce an ethos of fairness in the sphere of political action of church and state precisely in those places where the person of different faith is in a minority. In these practical things it will become apparent whether we evade the cross which we are to bear or whether we accept it. This concrete everyday realm is the place where it will become apparent whether the word of Christ, "My Kingdom is not of this world" actually determines the path of his church or whether instead of trusting solely in the Word which bears witness to the truth, we resort to alien means of power which in the end empty of its meaning the cross of Christ in our day.

These are some of the expectations which we Evangelical Christians entertain in regard to the members of the Roman Catholic church. We are convinced that these expectations can be realized even today. For in our opinion they do not contradict the spiritual bases of the Roman Catholic church.

But we also have *hopes* which extend to those of our brethren separated from us. Christian hope is paradoxical. It is contrary to appearances, and consequently it also goes contrary to facts which our reason has to accept as final. Christian hope dares to hope where there is nothing left to hope for. Christian hope does not by-pass the darkness of the cross. It hopes in spite of everything because it believes that he who was crucified is risen. What we Evangelical Christians hope for from the members of the Roman Catholic church is such that these hopes are meaningless if one forgets even for a moment that Christ is risen from the dead. We dare to hope, as a matter of fact, that the apostolic Word of Holy Scripture which is common to the divided churches will by the grace of God unfold anew its power among the

members of the Roman Catholic church.

That is certainly an "absurd" hope according to the judgment of the historian and the dogmatician. May one still have hope for a church which, in rejecting a movement of reform arising in its midst, has shut its eyes to the truth of Christ, to the very heart of this truth? May one still hope that this church will once more allow the pure Word of God to penetrate it and will cast off all its alien, human accretions? Does not our experience indicate precisely the opposite? What can we Lutherans expect from the Roman Catholic church after the last dogma proclaimed by the Pope but that it will oppose more obdurately the aggressive power of the apostolic Word? But in spite of all our experience we still have the audacity to hope that the Word of God will demonstrate, even in the Roman Catholic church, its dynamis, its explosive power.

We preserve this, our sole but all-embracing hope, in spite of the finality of the historical and dogmatic separation. The God who has raised Christ from the dead acknowledges no historical or dogmatic finality in the history of his church. The Word of God does not allow itself to be bound within the prison of such finality. True, we do not see how the pure apostolic Word could break the strong fetters which, particularly since the sixteenth century, have helped

dogma to blunt and bind the *dynamis* of this Word. The changes to which the Roman Catholic conception of tradition has to a large extent been subjected through the proclamation of the dogma of the assumption of the Virgin Mary seem to us to have welded these fetters even more tightly together. In such a situation, which to human sight appears to be without solution, we dare nevertheless to hope that the power of the apostolic Word as it has been handed down to us in the Holy Scriptures will in spite of all the shackles unfolditself in the faith, the thought and the life of the members of the Roman Catholic church. That is the sole and at the same time the very highest hope which it is given to us to have for you here on earth. All that we hope for you may be summarized thus: May you hear and accept clearly and unambiguously, without any additions, the voice of God speaking in Holy Scripture — precisely there in Scripture, from Scripture and nowhere else.

It is not our task to ponder what such hearing and acceptance of this voice of God may mean for you in the church, what consequences this will involve in regard to your relationship to the Roman Catholic church, whether such hearing and acceptance of the apostolic Word could perhaps call forth a completely new kind of reformation of the Roman Catholic church, different from that of the sixteenth century, and what the consequences of this would be for the relations between our two confessions. We have no intention of trying to determine in advance by our own ideas the ways of God. But we know that the future of Christianity depends on this. Shall we Lutherans hear God himself speaking unambiguously and clearly by the Word of his prophets and apostles which has been handed down to us in Holy Scripture? Will you Catholics hear God exclusively in this Word, with that exclusiveness which alone the voices of the authoritative witnesses of the resurrected Lord can and do claim?

Our hope goes even further, beyond this earthly life. We shall die without having been able to see the unity of Christianity with our mortal eyes. We cannot expect that our children or children's children will live and die within a Christendom united in faith. But we hope that the members of the Roman Catholic church also will find and keep to the way of eternal blessedness and with it the way to the consummation of the church before the throne of God. That is truly an ultimate and eschatological hope.

This hope is also for a member of the Evangelical Lutheran church anything but an everyday matter of course. For we have no right to expect that the way to eternal salvation will be shown so clearly and unambiguously to the members of the Roman Catholic church that they will be able to find it without difficulty. The Evangelical Lutheran church would have no right to exist if it were not convinced that for the sake of salvation, and because of its responsibility for the eternal destiny of souls, it must be separated from the church of Rome. A member of the Evangelical Lutheran church does not as a matter of course continue to hope that souls will be saved for eternity even where false

doctrines perilous to the soul prevail. But we cleave to this hope in regard to those members of the Roman Catholic church who really participate in the spiritual life of their church and who uphold to the end the gift of their baptism. For we recognize that the means of grace are not entirely destroyed in this church. We know of cases of apostasy in the churches of the Reformation which are to be taken so seriously that one may well ask whether the substance of what is Christian is not better preserved in the heretical church of Rome than in those places where it is erroneously believed that Luther's Reformation can be appealed to in support of subjective modernism. These considerations prevent us from looking down condescendingly upon the members of the Roman Catholic church. But may I be permitted to say that we tremble for the salvation of the souls of those for whom it is impossible to meet the pure message of the justification of the sinner as it has come to light again in Christianity through Martin Luther? Will it not be interpreted as a form of pride if we hope that the members of the Roman Catholic church may - in spite of everything - attain to eternal salvation? We cannot defend ourselves against this interpretation. We can only confess to this hope, which shares that character of which the apostle Paul wrote, "Hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it" (Rom. 8: 24-25).

We do not know whether God will remove the division in Christianity at a given moment in history and give it visible unity. We do not know whether the reunion of the churches will be an event in church history or whether it will be an apocalyptic event at the end of history. But we know that the resurrection of the dead will make gloriously manifest the unity of the body of Christ. That is our ultimate hope, our eschatological hope, that all who love our Lord Jesus Christ to the end will recognize each other at the resurrection of the dead as members of this one body, even if on earth they belonged to churches which, by means of the anathema, mutually excluded each other. With this ultimate, eschatological hope we Lutherans should embrace and bear in our prayers of intercession the members of the Roman Catholic church.

Si quis non amat Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, sit anathema, Maran Atha. [If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema. Maranatha.] (1. Cor. 16:22).

Gratia cum omnibus, qui diligunt Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum in incorruptione. [Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.] (Eph. 6:24).

# Basil of Caesarea and the Dogma of the Holy Spirit

The Nicene Creed (technically speaking the "Nicaenum Constantinopolitanum")—the creed that unites Christendom as nothing else does, yet whose third article has so divided it—is far from having found a definitive interpretation as to its origin and meaning.

The critics who refuse to attribute the Nicene Creed to the Second Oecumenical Council of Constantinople (A. D. 381) no longer predominate, it is true. But they have by no means been silenced, and notable arguments can be raised on their behalf. There is, moreover, a lack of unanimity regarding the interpretation of these highly significant words. Yet, with but one word more or less (filioque), they are to be heard in every Greek liturgy and Latin mass, and on high festivals in our services as well.

Questions concerning the Nicene Creed take on added importance since it was at Constantinople that the confession of the Holy Spirit, only briefly mentioned at Nicaea (καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεδμα τὸ ἄγιον) first took on fuller expression. Fuller, but dare we say full expression? The opinion is widespread that the Nicene Creed was too concerned about the situation of the moment, and that it attempted, by means of accommodating formulation, to win over the last important opponents who refused to make, at least in regard to the third article, a trinitarian confession.

The situation was in fact confused enough. The description drawn by Gregory Nazianzus in the last of his famous five theological discourses on the very eve of the Council of Constantinople is familiar.

"There is a confusing multitude of concurrent viewpoints. Like the Sadducees of old, some do not want to hear anything at all about a Holy Spirit. In this point some of the pagan philosophers are closer to us since they at least acknowledge him and merely fail to agree on his name. From among the 'wise men' inside the church, some hold that the Holy Spirit is a power (ἐνέργεια), some that he is a creature (κτίσμα) and others that he is God. Still others do not know what decision they should make—because they stand 'in awe of the Scriptures', as they say; for this reason they want neither to worship nor not to worship him, but would rather take some sort of middle position which is in reality a very unhappy one.

"Among those who hold that he is God, some conceal it in their hearts; some dare to express it. Others who wish to be more clever measure the Godhead; they confess the three Persons but distinguish among them in such a manner that the first Person is declared to be infinite in essence and power,

the second Person only in power, and the third infinite in neither. Thus they interpret them as the 'Creator', the 'Helper' and the 'Servant' and make of the order of names an order of function" (c. 5).

What remarkable lack of clarity in the moment of decision!

Even more remarkable is the explanation which Gregory gives for this situation. Point by point he discusses the language of the Scriptures, how much is put in figurative speech, how other things are merely hinted at, rather than expressly stated. Here one must hold to what is meant rather than to letters and syllables.

"The cause for the use of such veiled language lies too deep to be easily understood. There are two great life-changing events in the history of humanity which may be compared to earth-quakes: the one involving a change from idolatry to the Law and another from the Law to the Gospel. A third has been promised to us: the transition from here to there where nothing is in movement or vacillation any longer. But since we are not to be forced but rather convinced and since nothing that is involuntary is lasting, the loving-kindness of God proceeds considerately, like a teacher or physician. Therefore after the idols had been abolished the sacrifices were allowed to continue for a time, and after they had fallen away circumcision remained. Men had first to become Jews after having been pagans, before they became Christians after having been Jews.

"In theology, however, it was otherwise, not by subtractions but by additions. The Old Testament openly proclaimed the Father, less clearly the Son. The New Testament revealed the Son, but only alluded to the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Now the Holy Spirit has been 'naturalized' (ἐμπολιτεύεται) and he himself makes his revelation clearer to us. It was not safe to proclaim the Son openly so long as the divinity of the Father was not known and it was not possible to 'impose the burden' (ἐπιφορτίζεσθαι) of the Holy Spirit so long as the divinity of the Son was not acknowledged—just as a child can become used to solid food and a sick person to sunlight only very slowly. By means of gradual addition and ascent, progressing from glory to glory, the light of the Trinity was able to shine forth resplendent. (c. 25).

"For this reason the Holy Spirit tarried with the disciples only gradually (κατὰ μέρος), according to their progress. Therefore Jesus too explained him only step by step. First, in order not to appear contrary to God, he *prayed* that the Father would send [him] [John 14, 16, 17]; then he promised that 'he will send in my name', without the prayer, but clinging to the Father [John 14:26]; afterwards Jesus says, 'I shall send', emphasizing his own majesty [John 16:7]; and finally Jesus proclaims about the Holy Spirit that 'he will come', calling special attention to the authority of the Spirit [John 16:8] (c. 26).

"We also shall kepp to this order of 'theology' (τάξις θεολογίας), neither saying everything at once nor keeping it all hidden to the last."

The guiding principle of this discourse, which was read by later generations as the valid interpretation of the dogma of the Creed, is therefore the idea of a revelation gradually being unveiled. And the speaker is convinced that this idea is in harmony with the Scriptures which themselves are supposed to have led up to it.

The Creed as a godsend for the hour, to bring an end to the total confusion; the recognition of the divinity of the Spirit as the meaning of the dogma—this is the way Gregory, the friend and disciple of the great Cappadocian, Basil of Caesarea, understood the meaning and purpose of his time. But if this is the right understanding of this Oecumenical Creed,—why does it not say so itself? Gregory appeals to his teacher, Basil of Caesarea. After Athanasius, who with his four letters to Serapion enlarged on his doctrine of the Trinity in the third article, it was really Basil more than anyone else who confirmed belief in the Holy Spirit and defended this belief against attack. His principal work, *De Spiritu Sancto*, is the most important testimony of this time in the church's struggle on behalf of its confession of faith.

In order to approach this important writing one has to solve a literary problem. In his book, Basil discusses objections regarding him and his cause which raise basic questions in concisely formulated sentences. These objections are not only similar to one another in form and content, but also fit with remarkable exactness into Basil's own train of thought, raise an objection, give a concession here, insist on another point there, just as if they were acquainted in each case with the preceding argument of the book. Thus we have a situation which is the reverse of the not infrequent one in which a work like Origen's Contra Celsum follows in its argument the sequence of an earlier work and where possible examines it critically sentence by sentence. Here it is the train of thought of the book which is interrupted by the objections and which they seem to presuppose.

For this strange circumstance three explanations arise, two of which can be quickly dismissed. One would be that a critic had made marginal notes in a first edition and that these notes had been taken into account in the second edition. But two differing versions of the work just do not exist.

Another, and at first the most obvious possibility would be that Basil himself, adopting a contemporary stylistic device, had formulated current or possible counter-arguments in order to enliven his expositions by means of a dialogue. Then the objections would serve only to bring the theses of the author himself into sharper relief. But this explanation is also inadequate since the answers attack not only the content of the objections, but also their form and attitude. (For example, the remark that a sentence quoted is the rash word of an angry man cannot possibly refer to a turn of phrase coined by the author himself; and the censure that another counter-speech was concerned with a "foreign" expression, the full import of which the other speaker evidently did not realize, would likewise seem strange if this expression derived from the

author himself.) Moreover, the propositions are brought forth with such personal warmth and force of conviction that they demand a speaker with personal individuality.

Then there remains only the third explanation, that the document was preceded by a real conversation, the record of which the author had in front of him and used in the elaboration of his work. This interpretation, with which indeed all observations are consistent, leads us immediately to inquire into the person of the other speaker and to look out for signs which can define more closely the place and time of the conversation. At least we can come to conclusions of a highly probable nature in this point. The assumption nearest at hand is namely that the partner in the conversation is Basil's one-time friend and later embittered opponent, *Eustathios of Sebastia*. Some years before the composition of his work, Basil had held a two-day conversation with Eustathios in Sebastia where he was bishop, on just such themes as these. The record of this conversation, which ended in victory for Basil, could have provided the thread on which were strung Basil's own answers, expanded and elaborated.

Thus not only is the structure of the book explained, but much more is gained. In the first place, a much-discussed figure like that of Eustathios emerges from the mist of polemical reports and can be apprehended in his own words, short and incomplete as these may be. Further, the area of confrontation is defined in which Basil's arguments were formed. Thirdly, one understands the way the book goes about its task, so striking at first, of countering objections, without nevertheless intending to be a polemical writing. The work is meant to discuss the questions among a very small number of people and takes account of the opponent's objections only in so far as they could make an impression on Basil's own friends. If one looks more closely, one notices that between the record of that conversation and the writing of the book the tone has become sharper. In the meantime the breach between the friends had come about and it had become impossible to bridge over the gap.

But here we are already in the midst of the conflicts which form the background to the writing and which caused it to come into being.

Its direct cause was the question put by Bishop *Amphilochios of Iconium*, a close acquaintance of Basil's, on the compatibility of two liturgical formulas used by Basil at a church festival, one of which had come up against vehement opposition. The first was, "Glory be to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit", and the other, "Glory be to the Father with the Son and with the Holy Spirit". The second was felt by some of the participants at the festival to be a defamation which signified an undue exaltation of the Holy Spirit.

That in this question it was not a matter of an insignificant detail is shown already by the passionate vehemence with which—as Basil learned—the opponents considered everything to be at stake, and it is shown no less by the sincere earnestness of Basil's own answer. For this question unfolded the whole doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Can we be surprised at that? All great dogmatic controversies have their liturgical consequences or indeed are sparked by some liturgical formulation. One can even say that it is in this area that church conflicts ought to be decided. It was a pity, for example, that the German church struggle was not able to discuss and fight out to conclusion the question as to what the right form of intercessory prayer for those in authority is.

What was the situation at that time? Basil entered the controversy about the understanding of the Holy Spirit while attempting to mediate in it. Certainly, as a young writer, when he championed the church's doctrine against Eunomios, the leader of the Arians, he had already had to meet attacks against the third article of the church's confession. But in other cases he had advocated peace and advised against all excessive dogmatic claims, as long as what was necessary was preserved. It was then the suspicion into which his friend Eustathios of Sebastia had come which summoned him to action. He had always been faithful to Eustathios, who as leader of the monastic movement in Asia Minor had encountered much antagonism, and he wished now to counter the increasingly loud accusations, aimed also at Eustathios' doctrine, by visiting him in Sebastia and seeking to establish doctrinal agreement. The long conversations which he had with him showed at first, it is true, considerable differences, but ended happily; Eustathios allowed himself to be convinced. A document establishing peace was to have concluded the discussions and at the same time to have silenced all the doubts cast on Eustathios' orthodoxy.

But then it happened, as it so often does, that what was to have been the seal of unity became the cause of strife. Eustathios and his followers felt themselves forced into something which they did not want, considered that they had been deceived, and, without formally revoking the signature, forced a break. They covered Basil with reproach, accused him of unfriendliness, lack of consideration, dishonesty, even of having made an understanding with a heretic, indeed of being dependent upon him. We still have some of the forged letters which were supposed to prove that Basil was a confederate of Apollinaris of Laodicea, and Basil's own letters, which are our chief source for the history of the dispute, bear witness to the profound disillusionment which threatened to make him doubt all men, since this one whom he had so trusted had failed him. Certainly the letters contain a presentation of the one side. But just as they seek to put the matter right, after Basil had kept silent for three years and left the field to his opponent, so they also contain the arguments of the other side and allow us to watch the development of the controversy.

It can be said that we have here before us as it were the classic example of many church conflicts. Originating in personal misunderstanding, troubled by very diverse motives, confused by secondary considerations and interests, the actual point at issue in such a controversy can often be discovered only with difficulty by both contemporaries and posterity, so that even at an advanced stage well-meaning third parties could assume that the controversy was but a

quarrel which had to be settled by an appeal for peace. Then there is need for penetrating insight and clear judgment in order to perceive the real antithesis, which—perhaps from the very beginning—had been hidden behind the personal tension. Although he too at times took up relatively irrelevant points, Basil did recognize on the whole with great certainty what was really the heart of the matter, and, however much he was prepared to sacrifice in regard to his person, he did not intend to abandon his cause, in order not to lose the only basis upon which true fellowship can rest.

Certainly the picture he traces of the situation of the church as it appears to him is ultimately as gloomy as it possibly could be. Even if elsewhere he successfully endeavors to keep the noise of battle out of his work, the last chapter of his book gives a portrayal of the state of the church of his day such as cannot be surpassed by the gloomiest of penitential sermons.

"The present situation of the church can be compared with a bitter naval battle, which must moreover be fought out in a hurricane and high waves, so that the individual ships of the fleet, which is hard pressed by bad weather, sea and enemies, are a danger to each other insofar as they have remained together. More than this, on the ships themselves mutiny is threatening the lives of those who have remained loyal. In the howling of the storm, the crash of the ships running against each other, the raging of the waves, the shouting of the combatants, the cries of the wounded, the voice of a captain or helmsman can no longer be heard, but in the general disorder and confusion the overwhelming distress and despair of life lead to the casting off of all restraint in sin. And even now, when shipwreck is so near, vain ambition makes the sailors quarrel over rank."

It is not only in the final words that the portrayal proceeds to the contemporary situation of the church, which can hardly be presented in gloomier colors. The writer's grief-filled glance travels back to the first appearances of confusion in the church. At the beginning it seemed to be only the Arian party which was opposed to the church of God. "But after the quarrel had become an open conflict, the flames flared up in other places, until finally the hatred became implacable. This earthquake was more violent than any raging of the sea. All the laws of the fathers, every foundation, every doctrine began to totter. Falling over ourselves, we are thrown to the ground by one another, and what is spared by enemies is destroyed for us by friends. We hold together only insofar as we hate a third party. If the adversary is away, we make war upon each other. Who can count how many have run aground and gone under? Whole congregations and their leaders have suffered shipwreck in faith. Pressure and persecution, jealousy and ambition, greed and apostasy are carrying out their work. Noise and strife fill the church and overthrow the true doctrine. Holy Scripture cannot arbitrate, nor can the apostolic traditions settle the differences between them. The fact that someone does not agree with other opinions is a sufficient ground for enmity. Affinity in error cements together.

Everyone is a theologian, no matter how soiled in his soul. Innovators have the best opportunity. Thus they force themselves into episcopal chairs, perverting all church order. No one wants to listen, everyone wants to give orders" (c. XXX).

The inference which Basil draws from such a situation—and that is why this portrayal of his belongs here—is that it is better to keep silent. Even the best that can be said only increases the discord. But since the truth may not remain without witnesses, there remains only one way out, to speak only where one can be sure of being understood. Basil expressly tells the person to whom he is writing that he assumes he can rest assured that he will not let the book fall into the wrong hands. It is destined solely for those who are of like mind.

That is an attitude which, conceivable as it may seem to us, must nevertheless appear questionable. But in the case of Basil, it is not just the expression of bitterness or of morbid depression, but his attitude has a theological basis in making a peculiar distinction, as in this very work, between kerygma and dogma.

Holy Scripture itself, he is convinced, practices silence by covering many of its doctrines with a veil which not everyone can lift. And therefore especially the apostles and the fathers entrusted many things to a "silent" tradition, in order to preserve the dignity and gravity of the mystery.

For what the uninitiated are not permitted to see should be withdrawn from sight, that is, kept from being published. Deeper insights, like the Holy of Holies, must be guarded against the low estimation which tends to befall that which is open to all. Thus *dogma* is that which is kept silent, whereas *kerygma* must be proclaimed.

To be convinced of the esoteric character of *dogma* does not mean, as one might think, that the church should withdraw itself in resignation from public life, in order merely to lead an undisturbed life in its own sphere. The distinction between that which should be heard (and used) by all and that which only a few can grasp, grows in Basil's opinion out of the nature of the intellectual as well as of the spiritual life. Both require a slow and tranquil process of growth. It is precisely what is best that can ripen only in quietude and under the protection of moral discipline.

Even so this doctrine is of sufficient significance and consequence as it is. "Dogma" no longer implies a decisive doctrinal distinction. The doctrines which are meant for public proclamation and perhaps are to be determined by a council are "kerygma". But in this it is not just a matter of terminology, as if what is otherwise called "dogma" were called by Basil for some reason or other "kerygma", while in "dogma" one had only the tradition not as yet fully determined, or views sanctified more by church custom than by ecclesiastical decision. "Dogma" for Basil is not the stage which precedes "kerygma" but the

one which follows it, not the root—despite the fact that they belong together—but the fruit.

This distinction between kerygma and dogma not only explains Basil's dogmatic reserve, which confused even his friends, who assumed it to be an "economy", by which the bishop who found himself in a very delicate position kept himself in office or—as Athanasius interpreted it—by which he accommodated himself to the understanding of weaker brethren. The distinction is also important for us, as we now proceed to trace out some of the basic traits of his doctrine.

Certainly Basil knows of the polemic necessity to define public doctrine more closely, so that the warding off of alien ideas is one of the impulses driving the development of doctrine. But just as he follows this necessity only when forced to, so also it is precisely from the point of view of the slow growth of insight that the distinction between *kerygma* and *dogma* receives its justification. Expressed or merely implied, it is involved in every phase of his development and must not be overlooked.

The point of view with which his writing Adv. Eunodium begins is the insight into the total distinction between that nature which rules and sanctifies and that which serves and is sanctified. The sovereignty of the Holy Spirit over all creation is an axiom which requires only Scriptural evidence, but no rational proof. It is at this point that the distinction becomes clear-cut not only between what is true and what is erroneous, but also between the godly and the ungodly.

The first non-polemical writing, which Basil had written even before his controversy with the Pneumatomachians, is entitled *De fide*, and was incorporated into his *Corpus Asceticum*. In it he expounds his thought to a group of monks, presenting by means of a series of biblical statements his own personal confession of faith, whose third article deserves our attention. For though it also shows indication of his future doctrinal position, this third article, even more so than his later statements, raises questions in regard to the impulses which pressed the final credal formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity. For the conviction that the Spirit rules here and now played a decisive role in monasticism. It was believed that in monasticism there was a renewal of the primitive Christian *charismata*, there was the conviction that all members of this movement were or in any case ought to be Spirit-filled men, and it was found that in the effective experience of the Spirit lay the basis or aim of all individual endeavor. For this reason it could be expected that the monastic movement would be most immediately interested in this dogma.

Indeed, *De fide*, addressed as it is to monks, sees the working of the Holy Spirit especially in the distribution of the *charismata*, in the teaching of the mysteries of God and in the imparting of moral power, in "sanctification". And when in addition mention is made of adoration in worship, this has its place in the church at large just as much as in the monastic communities. Only the

mention of the "sealing" in baptism belongs entirely to the church at large and indicates the direction which the bishop's thought will take. It is only in the context of his whole doctrine that—at least for Basil—the answer can be found to the question as to the share which the monastic movement may have had in the development of this dogma.

One of the characteristic features even of the young Basil is that thought and experience remain united. Although at the beginning Basil emphasized those special experiences which the monastic movement, to which he himself belonged, was accustomed to exalt, one finds that bound up with them are both the common Christian experience and Basil's own personal experience of salvation bestowed in baptism. But here we find ourselves in the doctrinal context which was fully unfolded in *De Spiritu Sancto*.

It would distort the picture if in presenting what Basil has to say about the Holy Spirit one were to attempt to force his words into a given system and compel him to answer questions which he put to himself only incidentally, if at all. The gain of a systematic survey would be dearly bought with the loss of authenticity. It is characteristic that he is occupied hardly at all with problems of scholastic dogmatics and that, where others demand conceptual clarity, he in most cases fails, and likes to point to the divine mystery which must not be tampered with, as well as to the limits of our reason. That is true not only of the problem of the τρόπος τῆς δπάρξεως of the mode of being of the Holy Spirit, but also of the more immediate question as to the Holy Spirit's "theology", that is, the confession rendered to him as God. Alongside the conscious reserve which made him feel obligated to present only the "kerygma", not the "dogma" to his congregations, his reluctance to give any more dogmatic precision than is necessary cannot be overlooked.

Basil omits definitions less on principle than out of a pious aversion to importunate rationalizations of what is inaccessible to human thought. It was not as if he refused to give an account of his faith. He was clear about things. But we shall do well to follow him where he does give reasons and express ideas, and not to demand answers where he fails to give them. Let us follow his way!

If we ask about the point at which his theological thinking begins, we shall find that the objective and subjective coincide at one point. There are theological systems which begin with the Incarnation, others which set out from the Sermon on the Mount, or others for which the Cross stands at the center of their reflection, others again which take the Resurrection as their starting-point. For Basil's own life baptism represents the "beginning of life" and the "first of the days". "The word spoken over me when sonship was conferred on me by grace is the most precious of all words. It led me to the light and granted me the knowledge of God." This wholly personal witness guided his life, which was to remain in the "protection" of the baptismal

confession of faith. He desired nothing else for himself than to go to the Lord with this confession.

It is obvious that baptism was for him the basic religious experience. And yet we do not have here simply a "theology of experience". His concern is the solid givenness of the command to baptize. This determines the baptismal formula, the confession of faith and—what is never absent—doxology, the praise of God. If Basil's thinking sets out from this point, it shows that his theology is already trinitarian in approach, also in the sense that it is based on a word of revelation which is at the same time both doctrine and command, thus maintaining its connection with the usage of the church in baptism, in the confession of faith and in worship. Even as he reflects on that ultimate responsibility, when we have to justify ourselves before the divine judgment, it is by this word of the Lord, which includes the Holy Spirit in union with himself and the Father, it is by the knowledge of God imparted through baptism, and it is by that threat which declares blasphemy against the Spirit to be unforgivable, that he is assured in his conscience that he is advocating the right cause.

"What is it that makes us Christians? Faith, everyone will answer. And how are we saved? Obviously in that we are born again through grace in baptism. How then can we, if we have acknowledged the salvation which is assured through Father, Son and Holy Spirit, reject the doctrine which we have thus received (τύπον διδαχῆς, Rom. 6:17)? To preserve this faith intact to the day of Christ, we must preserve the Holy Spirit unseparated from the Father and the Son, in that we hold fast to the baptismal doctrine in confession of the faith and the offering up of praise" (c. X).

"Should we not praise and exalt him who is divine in his nature, incomprehensible in his greatness, mighty in his works, good in his benefits? But I know no better way of showing him honor than recounting the experience of his wonders. To be mindful of them is the greatest praise. Indeed there is no other way in which we can praise God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and his only-begotten Son than in recounting their wonders as we are able" (c. XXII—XXIII).

The famous sentence of Melanchthon's "Christum cognoscere hoc est beneficia eius cognoscere" [To know Christ, this is to know his benefits], could have been written by Basil, who, instead of defining the nature of God, meditates on his deeds and blessings, in the first as well as in the second and third articles. In the doctrine of the Trinity itself, his concern is primarily the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. In this, the "ὁμοούσιος" [the Holy Spirit's being "of one substance" with the Father], which is not mentioned any more than is the "θεός" [his being God], is replaced by the strongly emphasized "κοινωνία φυσική". This "fellowship in nature" means that the Holy Spirit, just like the Son, partakes of all the divine qualities and yet, while every thought of a "separation" or "foreignness" is averted, preserves the

Spirit's own hypostatic independence. The questions, later so much discussed, regarding the "έχπόρευσις" the "proceeding" or the "τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως" the mode of being of the Spirit, are not taken up by Basil. That is all wrapped in mystery, withdrawn from human thought. All the more important therefore is the "χοινωνία τῆςὸ ὁξης", the fellowship and participation in the praise of God. Only in praise and therefore in hymns may one dare to speak of the Spirit's nature.

But in tracing the works of the Spirit, one finds that the same is true for him as for God the Father. "One cannot recognize the Father from a distinction in works, as though he displayed a distinct working of his own, but from the honor ascribed to him by the only-begotten Son." For in every work, creation, redemption, consummation, the power of the Holy Spirit is just as discernible as the will of the Father and the work of the Son.

Accordingly, Basil, in following the works of the Holy Spirit, can even observe the formation of the heavenly powers. Thence, without pausing at the creation and preservation of the world, he turns immediately to the great work of redemption. This includes not only the earthly life of Christ, but begins already with the giving of the Law of the Old Covenant and embraces along with the speaking of the prophets and the virtues of the righteous also the great warlike deeds of the people of God. The working of the Holy Spirit then accompanies the God Incarnate, his baptism, his miracles, his resurrection. The adorning of the church with *charismata* and ministries is also his work. Finally, however, Basil turns to the future. The judgment, too, is not carried out without the Spirit's aid. Indeed, in this respect, one has the right to think especially of him. For by our attitude to him, by the faithful guarding of the "earnest" or, on the other hand, the grieving of the Spirit, our eternal destiny is decided.

But the Christian's knowledge of God, as Basil encourages his monks to preserve it in the face of the Pneumatomachians, the "enemies of the Spirit", is expressed in the sentence: "Our mind, illumined by the Spirit, looks up to the Son and, as in a picture, sees in him the Father."

Man's response to benefits experienced is praise. The doxology is the obvious word of conclusion in Basil's book on the Holy Spirit, partly because it represents at the same time the last among the works of the Spirit. The word of the Apostle is especially applicable here. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost" (I Cor. 12:3).

For Basil nothing is more characteristic than the fact that it was in praise that his faith found its necessary expression and confirmation. He had become conscious very early of the connection which existed between the fundamental Word of revelation, his decisive religious experience and the hymns in worship. To this he held fast all through life, so that the thesis connecting baptism, faith and praise belongs to the marks of his genuine writings. It is therefore not at all accidental that the controversy with the Pneumatomachians

was decided on just this point. Here we are at the very heart of his life and thought.

In an oft-quoted autobiographical testimony, Basil asserts that he has always maintained the same faith. "Other things about me may be censurable, but of this I dare to boast in the Lord, that I never have held or have had to change erroneous opinions concerning God; rather, from a child on, I have but multiplied and preserved that expression of faith received from my blessed mother and my grandmother Macrina. Since coming to the age of reason I have not gone from one to another, but I have only perfected those beginnings handed down to me by them. For just as a germinating seed grows from something small to something larger, though remaining in itself the same without changing its nature but, rather, being perfected by growth, so it is also my opinion that in my case the same doctrine grew progressively, not that the original has been supplanted by what exists now" (ep. 223).

The inner identity of faith as it develops, meditating on its origins, treasuring and perfecting them, has to defend itself again and again from the charge of innovation. That means that at the same time it must prove itself to be in agreement with the tradition of the church and her authorities. This demands ultimately a return to the solid foundation of all Christian doctrine, the baptismal command. But the inner sequence, which goes on from the baptismal command to the closely-knit triad of baptism, confession of faith and doxology, carries over to the witness of the Fathers and martyrs. It is here that confirmation for those concepts and formulations which have been called in question is to be found, and it is in the great testimony of faith of Nicaea that we discover the very epitome of correct doctrine, representing today that power and authority which existed at the beginning and of which it partakes.

The Nicene Creed, "that great kerygma of piety", as the most concise and authentic expression of the heritage of the Fathers, took on for Basil a more and more exclusive character. Though earlier he was able without reservation to comply with the demand to bring forth a confession of faith of his own (De fide), he soon gives preeminence in relation to all later confessions of faith to the Creed of the 318 Fathers of the first Oecumenical Council, and refuses to recognize any other or even to compose one himself, in order not to make something "human" into statements of faith. The basis for church fellowship is from then on the Nicene Creed, with supplementation in the third article, concerning which the fathers of the council had no reason to express themselves more fully. This addition has in the beginning negative significance. It rejects the creatureliness of the Holy Spirit. In the end it has a positive significance. It takes up the complete doxology. At most it would be the subsequent remarks of opponents which would force a closer definition. But Basil, in accordance with his view of the gradual growth of all spiritual insight, would prefer to leave this to the life in the fellowship of the church and to the special guidance of the Holy Spirit — to "dogma", not "kerygma". However,

in addition to the letter of the creed one still must have the right understanding, and this includes an interpretation which was still far from being considered, for example, by Athanasius (the three hypostases). But Basil's final word is that officially the development of the church's confession of faith has been completed. Except for the doxology, the Nicene Creed would not be able to bear even the least of additions, even in the case of the christological question, which was almost as pressing as the trinitarian one. It would only disturb the church, involving it in a never-ending cycle of problems.

Thus we have here a theology of the command to baptize. But there follows in close succession the confession of faith, the praise of the church and, in addition, the church's acts, the tradition and, as its binding expression, the Nicene Creed (of which, however, in *De Spiritu Sancto* Basil makes no mention).

But all of this does not involve the renunciation of the additional expectations which motivated him, or of what else had appeared to him as his task and goal in life. That which is enjoined upon and promised to each Christian is realized most certainly apart from the world and its temptations, in the stillness of withdrawal and in the fellowship of those of like mind. There the soul made pure is perfected by means of the Spirit and the ultimate goal is made manifest, the monks are woven as a woof into the fabric of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The foot of the Jacob's Ladder which leads on to the highest contemplation rests most securely in the lonely cell of the individual at prayer. Monasticism has its place in the history of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, at least as its actuating power, but also along with not a few of its ideas and conceptions.

Basil stands in a long tradition and many motives have had their effect on him. Yet he remained himself and has made a place for himself in the history of the church's doctrine. This explains also the way his era looked on him, how far it went along with him and the extent to which it would not follow him. His influence has a rich but not unbroken history.

Though Amphilochios, to whom De Spiritu Sancto was addressed, responded with ready agreement and a synod called by him itself embraced this work of Basil's, nevertheless it is perhaps not accidental that the great Council of Chalcedon, which placed Basil among the authorities of previous times, did not refer to this his chief work but to the much less characteristic document signed at Nicopolis. The dogmatic reserve practiced by Basil had long since been discarded.

By the time of the Council of Constantinople the situation had changed. Here too, though the Nicene Creed was invoked, it was not only expanded, but replaced. That is, Basil's warning went unheeded. But to understand the content of the new creed, which inherited both the name and the authority of the older one, a knowledge is necessary, not only of the doctrine of Basil's friends, but of his own. Perhaps it is saying too much when Basil is declared

to be the secret but dominant force of this Oecumenical Council, as he undoubtedly had been in Iconium. But the formulation given to the third article in the creed of Constanstinople is, if not simply the expression of his theology, then at least influenced by it.

Seen from Basil's point of view, the failure to include the terms theos and homoousios is not — as was thought — to be understood as a concession to the Pneumatomachians, even as this was not the reason for Basil's own failure to include them in De Spiritu Sancto. The fact that the works of the Holy Spirit are more strongly emphasized than his intra-trinitarian position, paraphrased only by a biblical statement (John 15:26), and the fact that among these works it is his giving of life (τὸ ζωοποιοῦν) and his speaking by the prophets which are singled out, the fact that among the church's acts it is baptism — and only baptism — which is mentioned, the fact that there can be no doubt that the Holy Spirit is to be taken up into the doxology — this is all very "Basilian". But certainly Basil himself would have put it differently. At the very least he would not have ignored the "the fellowship in nature", would have referred to the command to baptize, would have mentioned the Holy Spirit's participation in creation and redemption and perhaps have pointed to the order of baptism, confession of faith and doxology.

What was said in Basil's own area can be seen from the synodical encyclical of Iconium. Comparison here indicates clearly in what points the creed of the church followed Basil and what was omitted. Those formulations which testify to his influence show also its degree Later generations did not stop short at those insights which Basil had gained. New questions demanded new answers, permanently valid insights new expression. What Basil had been given to say was not always found to be adequate.

In the doctrine of the Trinity many demanded dogmatic exactness where he preferred pious agnosticism. And his warning against expanding the creed to include the question of christology resounded unheard.

It was not the fact of his giving a biblical basis to the church's doctrine, but the way in which he deduced the whole content of faith from the command to baptize that could not be found fully satisfactory. It appeared to many to be much too formal and legalistic.

Moreover, wide as the area of the Holy Spirit's working was extended — just in the fact that it was understood from a trinitarian point of view — when describing the Spirit's participation in creation, Basil confined himself, at least in his chief work, to the heavenly world of the higher spirits, without thinking of the temporal world and God's care for it. When pursuing the work of the Holy Spirit in the church, he referred to some things but disregarded others. He gave first place to baptism, and mentioned, for example, the fact of the adorning of the church with ministries and *charismata*, and the help given to all the faithful. What he left almost completely out of consideration was the

Lord's Supper and above all the church's proclamation. The Word of preaching is not understood as the bearer of the Spirit.

The reason for this can be found in the fact that for Basil the kerygma had lost its character as proclamation and address and had almost become a mere formula, which was still considered the starting-point and condition for all growth. But this growth was relegated to the less clearly-defined area of dogma. Dogma too is not simply entrusted to individuals, but is able and intended to be passed on, in fact it needs the fellowship of the church. But this has been withdrawn from the church as a whole to dwell in small groups of like-minded individuals. Similarly, Basil's thinking, with all its emphasis on the church, could not prevent the development of Christian insight and the practice of intensive community life in the exchange of charismata and in the exercise of mutual care and concern from being limited to certain close-knit groups. These, though not apart from the church, nevertheless led only a semipublic existence as special structures within the framework of the church. It is in the monastery that the Word maintains its strength, at least in that form and character which Basil ascribes to it, as counsel, instruction, consolation, admonition and perhaps as question and answer in intimate conversation. Here too the Holy Spirit is especially at work, giving charismata, sanctifying and teaching, in a way different from that in which he works in the church at large. For this reason a theology of the Word could find in Basil opportunity for substantial supplementation.

Ultimately it was the great questions first touched upon by Augustine regarding that working of grace, not conditional upon anything human, but in itself creative, which remained beyond Basil's horizon. "The wind bloweth where it listeth" (John 3:8)—Basil, who demanded the recognition of the Holy Spirit's sovereignty, did in fact set limits to his omnipotence, insofar as he made—even if in a well-balanced working relationship—the dominion of the Spirit dependent upon man's moral preparation. The problems which were still to be solved in this regard, which also lead up to those connected with divine predestination, never received that consideration on Greek soil which they did in the West.

Yet when we here encounter Basil's limitations, we find that they do not separate him from his contemporaries. They are theirs as well as his. At that time no objections were raised to any of those points at which later ages strove to go beyond Basil.

But if human seeking cannot be satisfied by even the greatest teachers, in fact—and at this point we must not express only anxiety—insight itself calls forth new questions, and no end to the process can be seen, Basil *did* find an answer to the question which moved his time, the question concerning the Holy Spirit. And this answer was given with inner power and authority. It was an imparting of his own experience, and yet out of more than personal authority, and it claims to be an interpretation of the Word which was decisive for his

life, the expression of the faith he had received, obedience to the command to baptize, and comprehension of the abundant works of the Spirit which he knew permeated and sustained the church.

His age—the best of his contemporaries—accepted his witness and recognized its truth. This does not mean that he was always understood, let alone followed in all he said. His influence was great, and indeed the ultimate decision cannot be imagined without him. But since for the most part it needed the mediation of others to open up the way for his ideas, it is not easy to obtain a survey of the history of his subsequent influence. The same thing which happened to him in the area of the ascetic life happened also in dogmatics. Not all of his leading ideas were taken up, though some had a profound and far-reaching effect.

Ringing forth from his works was no herald's proclamation, no partisan call with which he mounted the rostrum, no doctrinal lecture with which he went to the podium. The earnestness and calm which permeate his works can be explained therefore by the fact that he undertook, in the circle of those who were close to him, to give reasons and justification for his faith, searching for and giving answers, conscientiously weighing and refuting the argument of the opposition without. But it is primarily explained by the fact that he was always conscious that ultimately he had to lay this justification before the highest judgment-seat. That disciplined his language, did not indeed deprive it of any of its wrath against the desecration of what is holy, but mitigated the bitterness of his reproach and prevented its degeneration into pettiness.

Basil of Caesarea leaves us with two parting words. In a letter to Epiphanius, he is aware of the finality of the Creed's definition and the danger of deviating from it. His desire is to prevent here the appending of anything new.

Then in a fine closing word in *De Spiritu Sancto* he points ahead as well as above, finding in the eternal—in defiance of every anxiety—confidence also in the future here on earth. "Through us or through others the Lord will fill up that which is still lacking, in accordance with the knowledge granted by the Holy Spirit to those he deems worthy."

## The Church and the Break-through of the Eschata\*

### The nature of the last things

Courage is necessary to consider eschatological questions in an interdenominational group. For this most difficult part of dogmatics today is met with great perplexity, embarrassment and resignation.

Earlier, before the great turning-point in Evangelical theology, the situation was easier. Questions of eschatology were simply treated at the conclusion of dogmatics as an appended look at the future, after a system had been developed and organized in regard to the past works of Christ and the present state of the church. If this could still be done today, then there would no doubt be few if any important obstacles standing in the way of a truly mutual discussion of eschatology. Indeed, it could actually be a sphere of consoling unanimity after the painful discovery that it is difficult to come together in questions of the understanding of salvation and the concept of the church. It would then be possible from the standpoint of a common expectation of the end to relativize all these temporal antitheses by pointing to the final character of the "eternal" life of the future and by recognizing all our dogmatic differences and burdensome problematics as provisional and transitory. Then we could look towards heaven in the glad certainty that the higher insight which is there to be expected would transcend all these differences.

But actually the theme which has been set demands much more of us and in fact forbids us to regard the *eschata*, that is, the "last" things, in a one-sidedly futuristic way. The *eschata* are classified in a theological sense as "last things", but not necessarily in a temporal sense as well. For the present existence of the church with her unique life, her being in the world and acting in it, her preaching, her sacraments and her ordinances, is to be understood as the break-through into the relativity of human history of that which is ultimate, unconditional, simple, absolute, final. This means that our orientation is altered by 180 degrees.

It is not our task therefore to seek from the point of view of our thought forms, traditions, and attitudes, a common *eschaton* transcending these differences. That is, it is not our task to look from a present which is at our disposal to a future "beyond". But—on the contrary—we must determine our historical existence from the standpoint of that absolute. We must seek the right form of the church, understood as that point at which the *eschata* break through. Precisely when and because it is a question of the *eschata*, it must be a question of

<sup>\*</sup> Text of a lecture delivered at the last meeting of the Una Sancta movement, at Rothenfels, Germany.

the present, a question of our present relationship to the God who is coming, and of our relationship to our fellow men who are affected in the same way as we are by this future, the coming of God.

In this way the atmosphere of our discussion becomes more tense, for though previously it was possible to hold that in regard to the *eschata* one could look away from the controversial "first" things of the present, it is now precisely this delicate matter which must be tackled, and in so doing we must be frank with ourselves and with our Catholic brethren. May the fact that this is done not appear to be a presumption which seeks to overstep given bounds, but to be a token of willingness not to evade the decision which has been laid upon us.

The difficulties of this undertaking are well known. They are of a theological and a personal nature. There is practically no area of theology where we lack as much as we do here categories adequate to describe the reality in question. The given concepts with which we are familiar prove to be cumbersome and threaten to obscure the reality which they are meant to illuminate and to become falsified. Connected with this is the fact that the testimony demanded of us on behalf of the eschata is only possible in protest against much that makes appeal in our churches to these eschata. It must be in protest against every "claim" of pious ideas or institutions which maintain that they have taken lease on the eschata, but which in reality obstruct their breaking through. Let it be said in all openness, one cannot speak "Protestantly" enough of the break-through of the eschata, that is, passionately for their reality and passionately against their being usurped in the churches.

In order to avoid as far as possible falling into these dangers, it is necessary to make two preliminary decisions which are intended to keep the discussion from going off in the wrong direction. These preliminary decisions are concerned with the nature and being of the eschata as such, and not yet with the subject of our theme, which is the form of the church as it is qualified by the break-through of the eschata. Yet the theme can lead us to make these preliminary decisions and help to set the direction of the discussion. For it keeps us-like the New Testament itself-from trying to make statements about the eschata in themselves, that is, from speaking of "eternal life" without reference to "this life" in the present and in history. This attempt, so often made in theology, would necessarily fail to achieve just that reality which is at stake, and would lead to irrelevant reflections. In reality, eschata and prota, last things and first things, eternity and history, future and present are interwoven in such a way that history, along with time connected with it, is the vessel for reality as it breaks through, giving it form; is the soil in which, like a seed, it would take root. One could employ John 12:24 and say that the eschata must break into time, otherwise they abide alone und bring forth no fruit. It is precisely this understanding of the entry of that other, eternal life into time, its incarnation, which is thus the first decisive point which we must set. For in

regard to the entry and breaking through of the *eschata* it is not a question of some factor regarding the *eschata* to which we have to bear witness, the nature and characteristics of which are perceptible to us apart from such, but it is in these very factors that the *eschata* become apparent in the first place Only by breaking through do they come into being for us. And this is not something which is added to the present aeon and which needs then some sort of harmonization, but it is something which indicates the character of "eternal life" itself. The person who is either ignorant of or ignores the break-through of the *eschata* into the present, is ignorant of or ignores them all together. Any statement about the *eschata* which is meant to be an answer to the question, "What is going to happen in the future?" would be of no consequence theologically and would fail in its object.

Here Christian thought is distinguished from Greek philosophical thought, with which it has again and again been disastrously confused. The way the philosophers thought of the beyond, their conception of the *eschata* was a timeless idea. One can partake of the *eschata* only by means of thoughtful insight which ignores the historical aspects of human existence and soars above them into the timeless beyond. All that is historical bears the disparaging mark of transitoriness, since in the march of time it is constantly in transition towards being no more. The possibility of connecting the eternal with the temporal does not even exist, only the negation of the one in favor of the other. History is void, without impact from beyond, not a fabric, but only an individual warp without weft. It would be absurd on the basis of this thought to speak of a break-through of the *eschata*. Instead, one would have to speak of the elevation of the perceptive and pious spirit beyond space and time into the pure being of the beyond.

Over against this Greek philosophical approach it is necessary to start out from the basic biblical fact that God became flesh. If one is to speak of the *eschata* and of their breaking through, one must speak above all of Christmas. For here, at a specific point in history, at a specific place, in a specific person, the eternal, the real, the absolute breaks into the relativity of time and becomes man, an actual man, man as he is, man in whom God was well pleased.

In recalling this we have set the second point which must give direction to our deliberations. The *eschata*—which we have referred to as being impersonal —appear according to the witness of the New Testament in the form of a person. Thus we ought really to speak of the "last" or ultimate *one* (Christ!) rather than the "last" *things*, and of the church as the point at which this person, the *eschatos* breaks through. Wherever people live, think and speak eschatologically in the name of Christ, it will be decisively a matter of the world having a *thou* character rather than an *it* character, a matter of men and not of things. For where else but in Christ's personal loving, struggling, obeying, knowing, healing, raising of the dead, dying and rising again has the absolute

ever been unquestionably and finally realized? Where else but here has true

life appeared?

Nowhere else but in the absolute humanity of Christ and in his life does God, who created man as his partner, make himself known. And because Jesus is man per se, the new, the "last" Adam, the absolute realization of this one divine human existence will be the distinguishing mark of all occasions of the break-through of the eschata, the distinguishing mark of all true history.

The personal character of the *eschata*, which is so important in contrast to the Greek conception of eternity, is threatened on yet another side, namely by Jewish apocalyptic eschatology. This view threatens to falsify the biblical witness to the *eschata* and to drag it down to a pre-Christian stage of expectation of the end just as much as does Greek philosophy. Following the grotesque notions of late Jewish apocalyptic thought, the history of the *eschata* is understood as the last act of the history of the world, as an act which, just like the preceding acts, runs its course in space and time and can be demonstrated historically. This interpretation seeks a legitimate Christian basis in the account of the millenium according to Revelation 20. The *eschata* appear here as temporally tangible factors within history which are of a highly material quality.

The history of the church is a picture book of the great diversity of such chiliastic dramatic representations of the Kingdom of God. With their claim to go "in a Christian way" beyond the political orders which hitherto have been inadequate, they are all of necessity utopian. The latest and most grandiose conception of this kind is the secularized millenium of Karl Marx. All these forms of static political falsification conceal in an impersonal way of thinking the essentially personal character of the *eschata*. People want—and that is perhaps the original sin of man—to separate from him who is the *eschatos* those concrete effects which should be his. They wish to appropriate them for themselves, to organize them for their use, making them into political, social, moral objects. They lose thus their finality and absoluteness and become law; and law is always something provisional and penultimate.

The New Testament prohibits this error by means of the message of the cross and the resurrection, towards which every evangelical and apostolic message is aimed. Here is the point where the eschata enter flesh and time decisively and most concretely. But the cross as the place of the total and complete self-giving of Christ to God is the end of all "law", the end ultimately of all one's own achievement and accompanying values. What matters at the decisive point is man alone, that man who obediently follows the absolute call of God and in infinite love yields himself up unto death. On the cross it becomes clear why Jesus did not in fact establish a political kingdom and give it a constitution, doctrine and liturgy of an eschatological character. What was raised again to "ultimate" life was none other than the absoluteness of his love, his obedience and his sacrifice in death. The freedom of man as he is,

is thus maintained, and pierces the penultimate structure of *polis*, *bios* and *nomos* and opens up the "ultimate". The mystery of the cross and resurrection shows also that no one can artificially induce the break-through of the *eschata*. It can only be received and experienced. And the promise of this possibility belongs *not* to the law, but to Him who is the end of the law.

### The Break-through

Grace as "future"

In order to do justice in our thinking to the phenomenon of the eschata in their break-through, it is necessary for us to recognize that our formal scheme of time as a sequence of past, present and future, the course of which can be measured with clock and calendar, is not in accordance with the reality of which the Bible informs us and which we experience. Time appears here not as a neutral framework which can then be filled with the content we choose, but as the historical form peculiar to a specific reality. "Time" is not a quantitative, but a qualitative matter. An event like the incarnation of God creates for itself its own time, its time of preparation and its hour of fulfillment. Time and hour in the biblical sense are constituted by God's creative encounter with man. It creates the αἴων μέλλων (the future aeon) and liberates man from αΐων ούτος (this aeon), from time in its transitoriness, from time in which there is no hour of fulfillment between God and man and between man and man. Our calculation of time from the incarnation has its theological importance in the fact that only because of this history can one speak at all of a time of fulfillment or history as such. We have historical time, that is, a real "hour" only through the fact that God has time for man and encounters him in the πρόσωπον (mask, face) of the Son establishing the eschatological covenant. But where God comes to man in this absolute, final way, praeteritum and futurum, past and future are joined together in that present which belongs to him. The eschata are to be found where, in fulfillment of his promise, God is present in his humanity and is accepted (Luther's christology). From this standpoint it becomes clear that the Christian "future" is not the same as the Latin term "futurum", but is the break-through of a living dynamic, coming from God, into the present, so that this encounter changes mere existing into existence.

A man lives, insofar as he really lives, not from what he has become, but from that which comes upon him from God and awakens him out of the suffocating ties to what is given and to be had. We are alive as long as we have a "future" and are capable of vigorously accepting and absorbing that which comes to us, as long as we can say "yes" to our historical existence, which compels us to make a personal decision in relation to the future. This historicity of our life is described in I Corinthians 15:45-48 as the change from the first

Adam to the last Adam, from the living being to the life-giving Spirit, from the first man to the second man, from being of the earth, earthy, to being of heaven, heavenly. In other words, we have our real being through the fact that we lay ourselves open to God and his future and through the fact that, in continual transition from what has been to what God in his love accomplishes in us, we receive our being from God.

### Faith as surrender

The eschata break through not automatically, but in reality, understood personally. That presupposes on man's part the unconditional freedom and absolute courage to lay himself bare to the unknown future which belongs to God. The New Testament calls this attitude faith. It is not a characteristic of man which is possible of itself, through which he could meet God by virtue of his talent or achievement. On the contrary it grows of itself only by encounter with that future which belongs to God. In this encounter what has hitherto supported and given order to life is demolished. It involves an act of dying, a self-surrender wholly without guarantee, an unqualified "Here am I" which responds to the summons. This abandonment of self is the subjective aspect of the break-through of the eschata. It always entails in addition the dying of the old, the condemnation of idolatry, the demolition of guarantees. The eschatological chaos which precedes the divine future (cf. e.g. I John 2:18) serves to dissolve all the guarantees behind which man entrenches himself in face of it.

Thus the eschata never appear as an existing set of values raised to a higher power, but as the salvation of the man who has lost his illusions about these values or has lost the values themselves. Only the action of God makes out of proud and unhappy gods true men who in relation to him comprehend their real situation. In personal faith the lost condition of the prodigal son corresponds in the history of salvation to the eschatological chaos. For the eschata break through precisely when man in his scheme of values has come to the end of his resources, transforming this end into a beginning (cf. Matt. 19:20 f.: 20:16: Luke 13:25 ff.: I Cor. 15:8; 4:0). In other words, without the experience of the breaking through of the eschata man lives in bondage to the elemental spirits meant to give order to the world, the στοιχεία, which can neither give life nor make it possible, because they are weak and beggarly (Gal. 4:9). Only he who comes without "luggage", who holds fast to nothing but trust in Him who is to come, can find his way out of this slavery into mature sonship, into his eschatological inheritance. To hold fast to ties and ordinances as means to assert oneself and as a way to hide from the unknown eschata is a sin. The forgiveness of sin is the liberation from all this luggage, the liberation resulting in a new attitude which is no longer concerned with itself, with the rehabilitation of its own past and the securing of its own future. This is the attitude which alone is in accord with the unconditional

character of the *eschaton* and without which a man cannot master the great tasks of love, death and prayer.

### Fellowship as humanity

Where the eschata break through, the individual is liberated from the isolation of his self-sufficiency and made capable of fellowship. No man ever has the eschata for himself alone, but always with others and for others. For he has them indeed only in the "new Adam", in whom the whole of mankind is united. The "old Adam" can live neither with nor for others, for he separates men from God and plays them off against each other. The fact that the eschata liberate man for humanity has been largely overlooked within the Lutheran church, where one concentrates on an individual hope desiring the supposed salvation of the individual soul. People want to hear the Word of God and celebrate the sacraments "for the special comfort and strengthening" of their own souls. But the attempt to give meaning to one's own life in an individualistically misunderstood way must of neccessity fail. Where the eschata are, there we find "thou", there we find fellowship, there we find love. The eschata are concerned not only with the history of the individual, but they fulfill the whole history of mankind. For Jesus, as the new Adam, is the redeemer of mankind and frees the individual for that humanity which is his as a fellow-man. But an eschatological fellowship cannot be organized. Life lived out of the eschata is not at our disposal and bursts forth only in freedom and love. The various orders which we give to community can be no more than a help to true freedom and a sign of that life lived out of the eschata. No one can take away from a man his responsibility to listen for that which is approaching unawares and his free personal decision in regard to it. No absolutely fixed order of thinking, living, praying can absolve a person from such obedience and such decision. The Holy Spirit, the power of the eschata, does not compel, does not overpower, does not play the schoolmaster, but respects the man in man. Thus it comes about that the eschatological community puts iself beyond legal and historical scrutiny. And therefore this community is not as such a corporate body but a brotherhood, not related to things or ideas, but always related essentially to people.

### Adam as man of the world

The break-through of the *eschata* opens up to man the *world*. The *eschata* refer not only to man but also to relationships between men and to creation itself. Here faith is distinguished from all forms of *Gnosis* which desire to detach man from the world and seek to find the *eschata* in the spiritual. This doctrine is not biblical. Certainly Jesus calls man out of the world which is self-confident in its own diagnosis, which perverts the basic order of Creator and

creature, as is pointed out in the first chapter of Romans. But the break-through of eternal life in Christ Jesus opens up to man the world created by God and makes him responsible for it as a son who has come of age. Through the *eschata*, that which was intended in the creation of man in the midst of the cosmos and which has failed because of the fall, is realized again and again (cf. Gen. 1:28; Rom. 8:13 ff.).

In this it is a matter of a type of lordship quite different from the perverted power which, with the aid of technology, would seize instead of serve the world. The man who knows no ties exploits the world and claims it for himself as he has always done. But where the *eschata* break through, a totally different relationship of man to the world is suddenly revealed. He accepts creation with love and gratitude and is free of all fear of creature and creatureliness. In this, technology need by no means be exclused. But it has no power of salvation in itself. For here too it is a matter of personal relationship. The world appears as God's way of speaking to man and encountering him. And when the world is accepted with gratitude by man, it experiences a liberation to live according to its true creative destiny.

The eschata liberate man from his helpless subjection to the world. The person who lets the offer of "eternal" life pass by also lets this life pass by, and has lost the world instead of conquering it in love. He merely vegetates and tries to take refuge in the order of the world's affairs, expects to find in it meaning for his life and must inevitably fail. It is the eschata which first bring to man a truly historical existence, a genuine "worldliness" as given in creation. For the eschatos is at the same time the protos who has created the world. The second Adam is the first, the real Adam. In the break-through of the eschata resurrection takes place from that worldliness which is estranged from God and under bondage to death. Through the break-through of the eschata creation comes into its own (John 1:11).

### The Signs of the Break-through

According to all that we have seen so far, it is part of the nature of the eschatological break-through that it is not at our disposal and cannot be demonstrated and that it conceals itself in the appearances of the old aeon. Therefore there can be no orders which can be understood as directly eschatological in character, whether in dogma, worship, ethics or the forms of community. But for the same reason it is just as impossible for man to have some sort of subjective poccession of eschatological experiences of his own. Eternal life never appears as an entity, whether objective or subjective. For all entities have in themselves a tendency towards independence over against God and become corrupt. What upholds the church and preserves it from falling away from the *eschata* is solely the unchangeable life and faithfulness

of God who in his love encounters ever anew those whom he has called. "All things else have but their day, God's great love abides for aye."

If the *eschata* were the only reality which breaks through, there would be nothing to add to what has already been said. But, for the trying of the spirits, God has given us signs by which we can recognize how a breakthrough of the *eschata* has taken place and does take place. Disregard of these signs would endanger everything. For they distinguish the words which God addresses to us from the assault of all those anonymous powers and forces which do not want to proclaim the future that belongs to God and give him the glory which is his due. Man falls victim to them and is confused by them if he is not aroused by such signs to extreme watchfulness. Wherever something anonymous passes itself off as a source of life, wherever what is inarticulately vague is held to be the Word of encounter, wherever the future is expected from an "it" instead of from a "thou", wherever that which is preliminary and penultimate appears with the claim of being ultimate and absolute, the person thus deceived and self-deluding falls victim to futility.

Therefore the testimonies of *Holy Scripture* are intended to become effective signs of the *eschata* and to confront us with that future which is in God's hands. For this reason the witness of those who are gripped by the ultimate has the intention of proclaiming that ultimate in human speech and of testifying to its reality to those who accept it. Therefore there is a need for *commissioned messengers and watchmen* who recognize, awaken and foster the *charismata* in others. This ministry is certainly not to be confined to an institutional office. But it is necessary for everyone to know to whom he must turn to receive the effective annunciation of the *eschata*. This means someone who, in the name of Christianity as a whole which is empowered to do this, can open to him the kingdom of heaven and release him from the sin of wanting to do, to have and to know everything himself.

Such an obligatory handing on of the *eschata* may be done in many ways, in ways connected with the church and in entirely secular ways, in liturgical and free evangelistic ways. It will in any case be legitimized through *deeds* of love, through service in all fields, political, social, juridical, medical, artistic. Such action, witnessing to the *eschata*, will be able to give hope to mankind in despair in very concrete and very practical ways and to pledge itself to promote peace and a just ordering of the world. In protest against the desperate haste and mechanization of a world that does not know that it is God who gives men time, it will as a sign bear witness to the humanity of man and to the dignity of the individual. And through the joy and serenity which results from all this it will keep alive the basis of being a person which is not dissolved in the biological, the rational and the volitional.

The prototypes of all these signs are *baptism* and *communion*. Here Christ the Lord meets man with His Spirit which gives life and His gifts which maintain life. Here the *eschata* seek to break through in the person of the

eschatos and to be received in the liberty and courage of faith. Here it is a matter of the ultimate, of the incarnation and the resurrection, of the transition from the old to the new aeon.

Also among the signs of the eschata is repentance for all the guilt of solidification and petrification of life, repentance for all confusion of what is penultimate with what is ultimate and for all attempts to prevent the breakthrough of the eschata. In all these signs it will be the decisive question of "eschatologically" overcoming inertia, the proud or despondent preoccupation with self. They all signify release from the burden of the past and liberation for the future which is in God's hand. For where it is a question of the ultimate, it is always a question of "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."

### The consummation

The prospect of the end of the world does not in the strict sense belong to our theme. But we must speak briefly of it here, in order for us not to appear to have become entangled in a one-sided unbiblical overemphasis on the moment [Aktualismus]. The breaking in of the *eschata* into the present, which occurs in disguise and in constantly overcoming that which does not bear the promise of fulfillment, points above and beyond itself to a *telos*, an end, a purpose, in which that which is hidden will be revealed and will finally gain the victory over all opposition. What happens in the present has ultimate meaning only when what has had preliminary beginnings shall be complete, when what has been believed shall be seen, when the meaning of creation shall become manifest in its consummation and when all perversity shall be overcome. With the final end toward which this aeon is moving a limit is set which alone gives meaning and dignity to history. For beyond this limit is God alone with his final present. There is hope in this historical existence because after all provisionality God will finally come in glory.

However, we can make no direct pronouncements about the when, where and how of this consummation in God. These questions are wrapped in the mystery of the totally other, the denouement of which must be left to God and his future. In the end we should be denying what we recognized at the beginning as the points which gave us direction if we attempted with the irrelevant concepts and categories of this aeon to anticipate something of the consummation. The pictures in Revelation cannot be intended to describe a futuristic history after the model of what is imaginable to us. On the contrary, precisely through the difficulties which they offer to the imagination they preserve the mystery of the consummation. We shall revere the divine future and its consummation precisely in that we do not anticipate anything. All inquisitiveness and all impatience, all "pious" curiosity would represent

an escape from the present which God has given us and which has received the promise of future consummation. The future consummation is not to be gained by setting an absolute value on the present, nor by denying it, but only by standing firm in relation to it, without anticipating what is to be given. Eschata are always unexpected, and this is particularly true of their consummation. Every attempt to describe objectively how God will be all in all, how everything tangible will be swallowed up when God meets man face to face, would subordinate the new aeon to the old. Every attempt to anticipate the eschatological future would mean in fact to let it pass by.

This warning is meant to be very practical and very relevant for the moment. Our day looks toward the future with fear and seeks to anticipate it by securing protection, in the delusion that we ourselves create the future and that it results from the continued development of what is given and what has come about to date. Technology, which is supposed to eliminate the unexpected character in nature, and the organization of human society, which is aimed at limiting the unexpected character of the world of men, become means of revolt against the divine future. For both nature and our fellowmen are according to the Gospels instruments of the divine future. By means of technology and organization people seek to anticipate the future and to protect themselves against it. "The future has already begun" in the sense that we have an anticipation which is meant to ward off the break-through. With the aid of the penultimate man protects himself from the ultimate.

Wherever in our day this illusion is exposed and the future belongs to Him who is coming; wherever it is a question of the ultimate because the *eschatos* is breaking in; there is the church. The situation of the church is that of the alert, courageous *Maranatha*: The Lord is coming. Come, Lord.

### FROM THE WORK

# OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION AND THE ECUMENICAL WORLD

### World Mission\*

### A New Look at Policy

This year of our Lord, nineteen fifty-six, marks the two hundred fiftieth anniversary of the arrival of Missionaries Bartholomew Ziegenbalg and Henry Plütschau at Tranquebar in South India. These two Lutheran students from the University of Halle in Germany were the vanguard of the modern missionary movement. In this movement the world has seen an exodus of thousands of dedicated men and women who have gone to all parts of Africa and Asia, stirred into obedience by the Ascension Day mandate of a risen Lord.

In Asia colonial regimes preceded the missionary. This has been less true of Africa; but generally speaking most missionaries have had to do their work in a colonial political frame of reference. Today

all this is changed.

The change was in the making during World War II. While the War was still on, new political winds began to blow. People in the Orient were singing freedom ballads that revealed the yearnings of the heart. After the War one nation followed another in declarations of independence. The Bandung Conference served notice on the world that these new nations of the "old" Orient were not to be despised because of their youth. Even where political freedom has not been achieved, the thinking and aspirations of the new free nations shape the thinking of other Asian and African people. No one could miss sensing this in the greeting of Mr. Emmanuel Abraham, Ethiopia's Ambassador to Great Britain, when he spoke to the All-Africa Lutheran Conference at Marangu, Tanganyika, in November, 1955. In reply to the thematic

"We expect myriads of Africans to turn to the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ and find the fullest freedom which only faith in His Name can give. We expect this spiritual freedom in Christ for Africa to be followed by the relatively lesser but nonetheless essential freedoms to enable individuals and nations to live with dignity as human beings and at peace with their fellowmen . . .

"Fellow Christians, from whichever part of Africa you may be coming, be of good cheer, for your salvation in the fullest

sense draweth nigh . . . "

Political change or great national expectancy define the milieu in which the missionary works in 1956. This thought-climate happily spills over into the church. No one who attended the 1955 meeting of the Commission on World Missions at Järvenpää in Finland and listened to the discussions of Asian and African representatives could miss this fact. It moved the Commission to decide to take a new look at its policy in the next annual meeting, the one held last August at Hurdal Verk, Norway.

### The Course Charted at Oxford in 1949

The Commission on World Missions was appointed by the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Federation in late 1948. There were six members, all citizens of the West, but one of these was serving as a missionary in India at the time. The chairman, designated by the Executive Committee, was instructed to convene the first meeting at Oxford, England, in July, 1949, where the Federation Executive Committee would also be in session.

For those not intimately acquainted with the organizational structure of Lutheran foreign missionary work, it is important to note that in North America and Australia foreign missions are a work of the churches,

question, "What Do We Expect?" he declared in part:

The following article has grown out of the meeting of the Commission on World Missions held at Hurdal Verk, Norway, in August 1956.

administered by committees or boards. In Europe, where churches obtain their substantive support from tax money, foreign missions are supported and administered by independent mission societies. Membership in the Lutheran World Federation is by churches, consequently the foreign mission societies of Europe have no direct membership representation in the Federation.

In recognition of the independent status of European missionary societies, CWM's chairman, in consulation with the Executive Committee of the Federation, issued an invitation to the directors of the European mission societies to attend the Oxford meeting as resource people. The discussion in the first sessions at Oxford revealed:

 A fear that the Commission on World Missions might become a super-mission society.

The necessity to have representation from societies and boards at meetings of CWM if the Commission was to serve effectively.

These two concerns led the Commission to draft the following policy statement which was reported to and approved by the Executive Committee, meeting in another room of the same building in Oxford.

### Oxford Policy Statement

### 1. Statement on Purpose and Function

- 1. The Commission on World Missions shall serve to strengthen and stimulate the missionary activity of the various Lutheran churches that there may be a common testimony to the Gospel all over the world. As an agency of the worldwide Lutheran Church, we recognize that our authority is spiritual and that there must be no encroachment on the rights and functions of the member churches, national committees, and missionary societies.
- 2. The Commission shall originate and promote a study of Lutheran missionary activities and obligations. It shall seek to stimulate coordination and cooperation in all missionary work.
- 3. In view of the important tasks assigned to this Commission, the directors of the Lutheran missionary societies and boards should be added to the roster of consultative members.
- The chairman should have discretionary powers to invite advisory members from outside the group of consultative members.

- Meetings of the Commission should be ordinarily held once a year, but the chairman should have power to convene more frequent meetings as he considers necessary.
- The Commission shall report regularly to the Executive Committee of the LWF, to the national committees, and to the sending churches.
- 7. The Commission shall accept and carry out administrative responsibilities which may be delegated to it by the Executive Committee of the LWF or constituent churches or organizations affiliated with them.

## II. Statement on Relationship with Boards and Societies

- We acknowledge the necessity of close cooperation with all Lutheran mission boards and societies.
- 2. Such cooperation may be facilitated in some countries by activating a national commission for Lutheran missionary societies. In other countries it may not be necessary to have such an organization.
  3. When mission commissions are activated, it is desirable that national committees of the LWF secure nominations from the mission societies and boards.
- 4. If a national Lutheran mission commission is established, it should work in close cooperation with the existing national missions councils and other national and international mission organizations, especially the IMC.
- 5. It shall be the purpose of a national Lutheran mission commission:
  - (a) To act as a connecting link between the Lutheran mission societies and boards and the Commission on World Missions;
  - (b) To represent the missionary task to the national Lutheran committees;
  - (c) To further common thinking and the exchange of information, to solicit such help as may be needed wherever Lutheran mission societies are in difficulties; and to encourage that missionary work be done according to the principles laid down by the Lund Conference 1947.

Empowered by this policy statement, mission society directors and board executive secretaries have been invited as consultative members to attend each of the seven annual meetings that have followed after Oxford, but with the understanding that each

society and board would underwrite the travel expenses for its representative. The response has been almost phenomenal. Without any defined rights consultative members have attended meetings regularly. Mutual trust has established a practice where important issues are discussed until members and consultative members alike are agreed on the procedure and program to be followed.

In this context of mutual trust, more cooperation has been initiated and more coordination of work has resulted in the last seven years than during the past fifty

years.

The policy statement wherein CWM announced its readiness to accept assignments of administrative responsibility (see I., 7., above) was quickly seized by the LWF Executive Committee. This necessitated an executive office and staff, a need pointed out by the second annual meeting of the Commission in July, 1950. Two years later at the Hannover Assembly, the LWF Executive Committee recommended the organization of a Department of World Missions. The Assembly approved the recommendation and on September 1, 1952, the Department was organized and began functioning at the Federation headquarters in Geneva.

For the period September 1, 1952 to May 1, 1954, the executive secretary of the Commission on Younger Churches and Orphaned Missions of the National Lutheran Council (CYCOM) became the part-time interim director of the new Department of World Missions. CYCOM began immediately to plan relinquishing its grant-in-aid work (orphaned missions assistance) to the new Department. Planning was followed by a patterned action that transferred segments of the work in three successive stages: January 1, 1953; 1954; and 1955. If this is now followed by a transfer to Geneva of the administration of the Tanganyika work, all the National Lutheran Council responsibilities growing out of the war and postwar orphaned missions assistance will be in the hands of the Federation and its Department of World Missions. Few people will see this as anything other than solid gain.

The preoccupation of the Commission with the growth of mutual trust, understanding, and cooperation between mission boards and societies may have contributed to an apparent oversight. In the provision of consultative members, Oxford over-

looked the churches of Africa and Asia, despite the fact that some of these churches were charter members of the Federation. But this apparent discrimination must be seen against the background of the war years. There were limited budget resources for travel and critical European reconstruction needs that called for immediate attention.

By the time CWM convened for its second meeting at Tutzing in South Germany in July, 1950, the apparent obtuseness of Oxford to the need for consultative membership for the churches of Africa and Asia was corrected. The minutes of the Tutzing

meeting record:

"In these days when colonialism is disappearing and new nations are being born whose representatives constantly meet with the representatives of the older nations in the councils of the United Nations—the necessity for the Church to recognize the rising leadership in the younger churches takes on new importance."

"Voted: That an effort be made to add two younger churchmen as consultative members of CWM for the years 1951 and 1952 and that the travel funds for these representatives be sought from Lutheran missionary societies and boards."

At Breklum, Germany, in 1951, and at Hamburg in 1952, the Commission took steps to provide representation for the churches of Africa and Asia on the regular Commission roster of six members.

At the Breklum meeting in 1951 the Commission approved the following recommendation to the Executive Committee:

"... that the new Commission to be appointed after Hannover continue at six members but that at least one of these members be a representative from one of

the younger churches . . ."

In 1952 at the Hamburg meeting—which took place three months before the Hannover Assembly—the recommendation to the Executive Committee became more pointed and asked for a budget grant that would permit two out of the six Commission members to be appointed from churches in Africa and Asia. The Federation's Executive Committee approved this request and Dr. Manikam of India and Pastor Hirai of Japan became the two representatives. Last January the Executive Committee appointed Pastor Andrianarijoana of Madagascar to fill the position left vacant by the

resignation of Mr. Delbruck of France. CWM has, therefore, in the compass of seven years moved to a place where one-half of the representation is from the churches of Africa and Asia and one-half from the churches of the West.

## Elements Involved in a Reappraisal of CWM Policy

Two papers were presented at Hurdal Verk, one by Pastor Hirai of Japan and one by the writer of this article, each addressed to the topic: "Effects of the Changing Missionary Situation in Africa and Asia on the Policy of CWM as Outlined at Oxford in 1949." The discussion that followed these two papers led to the appointment of a committee that is to give the matter further study and then to circulate its report among members and consultative members before the 1957 annual meeting. Out of the 1957 meeting a new policy statement is anticipated "outlining the basic direction of CWM's program for the succeeding five years which statement shall be submitted to the LWF Executive Committee and to the General Assembly." Among several issues that will be placed before next summer's meeting, two will require a definite decision:

1. Has CWM become a missionary society despite the promise in its Oxford Policy Statement? (See I, 1 above) What is to be its pattern of operation in the future? 2. Is the representation of the churches of Africa and Asia in CWM's meetings adequate?

Has CWM become a missionary society?

Thus far much of the strength of CWM's work has been the intangible but real element of mutual confidence. No mission society director has for one moment assumed that CWM or its executive arm, the Department of World Missions, was in the field as a competitor. Rather, the Commission and Department have been conceived to be on hand to serve the societies, boards, and the churches.

The question that obtruded at this year's meeting came alive in the offer of the National Lutheran Council to relinquish the work it has administered in Tanganyika. This work involves a budget of approximately one-half million dollars and supervision of missionary work on three former fields of the Berlin, Bethel and Leipzig Mission Societies. Faced with this offer, CWM

reviewed the present work of the Department of World Missions. This review revealed that already an annual grant-in-aid program of approximately \$ 450,000 is administered. In two places where help is provided, the assistance involved is more than a grant of money. It also requires the provision of missionary personnel.

There is little question that LWF/DWM is administering missionary work in a manner similar to that of mission societies and boards. But technical breach of CWM's Policy Statement does not necessarily mean an invasion of rights that the Policy Statement was designed to protect. No mission society or mission board has been threatened by LWF/DWM's activities. On the contrary, all decisions affecting LWF/DWM's work have been approved by society and board representatives.

Present work of LWF/DWM is an outgrowth of the emergency assistance that had to be provided during the war years. Its expansion to the point of involving LWF/DWM in ongoing mission administration is the result of two situations:

(a) Extraordinary opportunities;

(b) Inability of the mother society to reassume full responsibility.

If LWF/DWM were to be relieved of its present missionary administrative work, it would mean that the responsibility would have to be assigned to some society or board. There is no European society or group of societies that can accept this heavy financial load. There might be American churches among whom the responsibility could be parceled out. But this raises the serious question: Is there not much more prospect of solidarity and good will among European societies and the churches of Africa and Asia who are concerned if this special work which grew out of the war years can continue to be administered by an international Lutheran organization in which all members of the Lutheran family have representation?

The answer to this question seems obvious. And if that should be the general feeling in CWM's meeting next summer, it is likely that the Tanganyika work will be transferred to Geneva as of January 1, 1958.

Is the representation of the churches of Africa and Asia in CWM's meetings adequate?

CWM began with neither regular nor consultative members from the churches of

Africa and Asia. Today one-half of the regular members are from Africa and the Orient and their churches have the same privilege as societies and boards in sending consultative members. But privilege without the economic competence to use it frustrates. The travel expense item prevents the churches of Africa and Asia from sending consultative members to meetings in Europe.

The meeting at Hurdal Verk gave some consideration to holding every other session of CWM in Asia or Africa. Inquiry indicated that this would not solve the problem, but would merely shift it from the East to the West. If meetings were to be held in Africa or the Orient alternately, many society and board executives would find the travel expense prohibitive.

The outsider looking in on the work of the Commission may see an easy solution for this dilemma. Some have proposed a solution by channeling CWM's inter-church aid through another department in the Federation. The assumption is that missionary board and missionary society executives could then continue to meet for consultation about their problems and the churches of Africa and Asia need not be concerned about representation in CWM. Such a solution would, I fear, create more problems than it would solve. The work of the boards and the work of the churches of Africa and Asia are one piece of cloth. No Lutheran church in Africa or the Orient is without some type of help -either in grants or loan personnel-from the boards and societies of the West.

The solution of the problem will not be easy. As the special committee that is to report next summer works to find an organizational pattern that will be mutually acceptable, the objective will be a climate of mutual trust. The same Holy Spirit who dispelled the Oxford fears of the society and board representatives in 1949 will also confer the grace needed for this moment.

Fredrik A. Schiotz

Missions Statistics for World Lutheranism

At the very first it must be said that the statistics that follow are not completely accurate. The most important reason is the fact that it is impossible to gather data when one cannot define just what information one wants. And the difficulty of trying to define the term "world missions" or "foreign missions" is proverbial.

The average Lutheran, when he thinks of foreign missions, thinks of the missionaries and the church in Asia, Africa and perhaps Latin America. Were he to try to define the term more closely, he would perhaps say that foreign missions is limited to the proclamation of the Gospel by people sent by Christian churches to people and lands of non-Christian religion and heritage. But this definition has its difficulties. Where do Ethiopia and Latin America fit in? Where does the work among Jews, American Indians, other such small minorities, fit in? Is not any work among, for instance, the Batak people in Indonesia, who have a greater percentage of church membership than people on the West Coast of the United States, then excluded entirely?

Or he might define such work as the sending of personnel or means or both to preach, teach and establish the church among peoples who are by race, culture, language or political allegiance separated from the sending church. The emphasis here would perhaps be upon the point that in "foreign missions" there is no intention on the part of the sending church of self-aggrandisement: the church is not trying to enlarge itself (as it is in "home missions"), but to go outside itself without self-interest, for the spread of the Gospel.

Apart from the fact that this definition emphasizes the divisions among men and in the church rather than the fact of the unity of the church, which can never really "go outside itself", it also includes a much wider sphere of activities than is generally associated with the term. Aid given from one church to another in Europe is no less foreign missions than the sending of missionaries to Africa. And the whole recent development that is termed "inter-church aid" must logically be included in the category of missions. A man sent as representative of the churches to Bavaria will be classed as a missionary as well as the man sent to help an Indian church. Funds remitted from America to assist churches in Europe are missionary funds no less than those administered by a board of foreign missions or a mission society.

However the definition may be phrased, the fact is that world missions is today a term which is impossible to define closely, and the facts presented are therefore subject to discussion and disagreement. They are either too inclusive or not inclusive enough. This survey must be content to present what is available. The table given below states the facts for "foreign" work by Lutheran churches, but excludes work done in Europe or English-speaking North America.

One other remark must be made. There was a time when it was thought possible to include in "missions statistics" everything in which missions were involved. Missions owned and operated churches, schools, hospitals; and the Christians who gathered round were regarded as "belonging to the mission". One hears that phrase even now, and where there have long been indigenous churches, proof that old ways of thought die hard.

Today we realize that the church is the church wherever it is located. The Christian congregation in Marangu is not less a church than the one in Hamburg, though it may receive help from abroad or even have a non-African pastor. Church membership figures then are not "mission statistics" even if the church is imperfectly organized. Facts regarding schools, hospitals, etc., belong as properly to the church, not to the mission, although the mission may have major organizational and financial reponsibility.

The figures given below include agencies and personnel working in "foreign" missions in Australia, Asia, Africa and Latin America. Although there is no record this year of the founding of new missionary agencies, nor (as there was last year) of the penetration of a previously un-entered land, it is nevertheless a pleasure to state that Lutheran missions are a growing enterprise. Most of the agencies reporting show increase in personnel as well as financial expenditures as compared to figures for a year ago.

Table I indicates the situation in the sending countries.

Table I Sendino Sending Number of Country Agencies Overseas Staff Australia Denmark 214 Finland 2 143 France ? Germany 15 482 Iceland 1 5 India 7 4 Indonesia 1 2 Netherlands Norway 518 Sweden 6 374 United States and Canada 14 1478 International 3 99 63 3379

Table II indicates the situation in countries receiving missionaries from abroad.

	Table II	
Receiving Country	Missions or Agencies	Foreign Staff
Australia	1	14
New Guinea	2	263
Indonesia	4	42
Philippine Islar	nds I	26
British North Bo	orneo 1	3
Hongkong	11	92
Taiwan	2	62
Japan	12	299
India	13	365
Pakistan	2	28
Malaya	1	15
Nepal	1	1
Arabia (Aden)	1	17
Iraq	1	7
Syria	1	14
Lebanon	2	11
Jordan	3	11
Israel	5	18
Egypt	1	3
Algeria	1	2
Morocco	1	3
Liberia	1	69
Nigeria	2	95
AEF-Cameroun	3	128
Ethiopia-Eritrea		174
Kenya	1	7
Tanganyika	8	295

Receiving	Missions	Foreign Staff
Country	or Agencies	
N. Rhodesia	1	6
S. Rhodesia	1	63
Union of South A	frica 7	392
Southwest Afric	a 2	147
Madagascar	3	283
Cuba	1	56
Mexico	4	28
Guatemala	1	12
Panama	1	2
Colombia	2	16
Venezuela	2	14
British Guiana	1	13
Brazil	1	7
Paraguay	1	2
Uruguay	2	4
Argentina	2	33
Chile	1	2
Bolivia	1	36
Ecuador	1	4
On furlough or unspecified		195
	122	3379

The figures above include three European societies which are not confessionally Lutheran but whose personnel is Lutheran (the Danish Moravians) or which on the field include themselves within the Lutheran family (Rhenish Missionary Society, South African Moravian Mission). The list of agencies includes the Lutheran World Federation and the National Lutheran Council, which administer work or contribute funds in many countries. LWF and NLC field personnel are included in Table I in the figures of sponsoring boards and societies.

The figures for overseas personnel do not by any means include all Lutherans in the work. French, German, Scandinavian and American non-denominational societies include a considerable number of Lutheran missionaries.

In some countries missionary personnel carried on a program of charitable, evangelistic or educational activity without a local church related to them. This first stage of missionary activity may, as it has in many Moslem lands, last for many years. In others missionaries were working

with and in indigenous churches. A few societies simply provided funds or personnel for use in work administered by other churches or by younger churches themselves.

Missionaries were found in many callings. Only slightly more than a third of the total number were ordained clergy. Nearly as many were wives, most of whom took some part in active work outside the home. Others included school teachers and administrators, medical doctors and nurses, dentists, lay evangelists (men and women), relief and welfare workers, builders and carpenters, business managers and office secretaries, store-keepers, printers and editorial workers, agriculturalists, plantation managers and farmers, ship captains, mechanics, airplane pilots. And many if not most missionary personnel combine many of these activities.

Figures received do not permit an accurate statement of the total cost of the missionary program to sending churches. An estimate based upon figures received, and not including government educational subsidies and other receipts on the field, would place the figure between \$ 14 and \$ 15 million for the year.

Arne Sovik

## Statistics for the Younger Churches

Membership statistics and other significant figures are given below for Lutheran churches on four continents and the Spanishspeaking section of a fifth.

These churches vary tremendously in size and character. There is the great folk church in Sumatra, the Huria Kristen Batak Protestant. There is the little fellowship in Algiers which consists of the pastor, his wife and a single Jewish convert.

There are churches that provide for almost all of their own needs in substance and in personnel. Among these are the churches in Australia and some in Latin America, as well as, for example, the Gossner Evangelical Lutheran Church in India, whose 200,000 members bring their gifts in rice as well as cash to the altar and

make their church self-sufficient except for a small subsidy and a handful of helpers from abroad. The church in New Guinea, in a society which is just developing a money economy, has always cared for its own pastors, evangelists and school teachers — 1800 of them in 1955—and built its own churches and schools. But its dependence on a large staff of overseas personnel makes it, in effect, somewhat less than self-supporting. Many others, however, with both more scattered groups and a less well-developed sense of stewardship, do far less well.

There are churches which are entirely autonomous, and with their own mission enterprises. There are others which are fully organized but whose autonomy is in some degree limited by mission relationships or ties with older churches. One German-speaking South African group, for example, is part of the Church of Hannover. And there are others which are "churches in becoming", still closely tied to mission organizations.

Not all these churches are "younger" in a chronological sense: Lutheranism is older in years in India than in the United States. Others are "younger churches" only in a chronological sense, not in the generally accepted sense of the term, for they have no paganism in their recent background. Included in these listings are churches which are the fruit of European Lutheran

migration to Latin America, Africa and Australia; their traditions and heritage are from European Protestantism.

Most of the churches listed here form the growing edge of Lutheranism in the sense that they live and work among population groups the vast majority of which are outside Christendom culturally as well as religiously.

#### Australia

There are two major bodies in Australian Lutheranism, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia (46,886 baptized members and 127 pastors, a member of the Lutheran World Federation), and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia (42,030 members, related to the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod). Both are in the midst of transition from German to English language in their work, with all that that implies, and simultaneously are trying to absorb thousands of new Australian immigrants. The UELCA grew by 4.7 % in 1955. Movements toward union have reached the stage of doctrinal agreement.

The UELCA cooperates in the Lutheran Mission New Guinea and for a hundred years has conducted missions among the nomadic aborigines in the central Australian desert. (Five congregations, 12 preaching places, 1013 baptized members.) Total Lutherans: 87,929.

### Asia and the Western Pacific

Lutheran churches are found in 16 countries. There are 38 churches and groups counting a total baptized membership of 1,493,560, divided as follows:

Country	Churches or Groups	Baptized Membership	Notes
New Guinea	1	150,037	A Missouri Synod mission has as yet no membership. Considerable areas are still unreached by missions.
Indonesia	3	637,534	Estimated, Includes HKBP, Batu and Mentawei churches.
Philippine Isl	ands 1	2,007	The only "Christian" country in Asia, majority of the population is R. C.
Japan	8	10,211	7.741 in Japan Ev. Lutheran Church. Union of newer groups with JELC under
Taiwan	2	3,586	discussion.  Work begun in 1951 around refugee nucleus. Fastest rate of growth reported.

Country	Churches or Groups	Baptized Membership	Notes
Hongkong	4	8,959	Estimated. Including Hakka, Cantonese and Mandarin speaking churches.
China	1	51,000	1953 estimate recently received. Communism has brought union of Missouri Synod group with other Lutherans, but drop in membership.
Malaya	1	20	Estimated. New work among Chinese. Indian and Batak diaspora are included in home membership.
India	10	627,552	Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Chur- ches has nine members, with mission program in India and staff with LWF abroad.
Pakistan	1	1,059	Pakistani Lutheran Church founded December 1955.
Arabia (Aden)	1	1	Danish mission, among Moslems.
Iraq	1	34	Lutheran Orient Mission.
Syria	1	161	Kalamoun Ev. Church, Danish Mission.
Jordan	1	1,269	Church now being organized, with German und LWF support.
Lebanon	1	40	Syrian Orphanage, Khirbet Khanafar.
Israel	1	90	Congregations in Haifa and Jaffa, largely Rumanian immigrants.
	38	1,493,560	

Of these churches, nine, with a membership of 1,227,817 hold membership in the Lutheran World Federation. Most of the others are in informal association, through related missions. The churches were served by 859 ordained indigenous clergy and 4,105 other paid workers. They operated 2,777 schools of all kinds with 8,042 teachers and 296,009 students.

Overall growth in church membership was approximately 3 %.

### Africa

Lutheran churches are found in eleven countries in Africa, with a total membership of 1,073,216. Of 37 groups, 20 were organized churches. Of these, two, with a membership of 311,141, are members of the LWF and most of the others are in informal association. The breakdown follows:

Country C	Churches or Groups	Baptized Membership	Notes
Algeria	1	1	Danish Israel Mission. A small group of colons has been relinquished to the care
Ethiopia—Eritrea	5	14,331	of the French Reformed Church. Estimated. Groups cooperate and are loosely connected with autonomous Me-
Kenya	. 1	100	kane Jesus Church, Addis Ababa. Estimated. Young work by Swedish Mission.
Tanganyika	8	241,669	Includes 15,493 Moravians.
Cameroun—AEF	3	8,652	Work begun in 1920's by three missions.

Country	Churches or Groups	Baptized Membership	Notes
Nigeria	2	37,105	Two churches with American and Danish support.
Liberia	1	3,521	Church associated with United Lutheran Church in America mission.
Southern Rhode	esia 1	8,834	Church of Sweden Mission works with African church.
Southwest Afri	ca 2	186,401	Ovambokavango Church (Finnish mission) and Rhenish mission.
Union of			
South Africa	12	367,108	Includes about 25,000 in German-speaking churches (3 groups). Union discus-
Madagascar	1	205,494	sions in progress.  LWF member church assisted by three missions.
	37	1,073,216	

Churches in Africa were served by 751 indigenous clergy and 5,269 lay workers, some of whom were school teachers. The 2,797 schools of all kinds owned or operated by the churches enrolled 185,567 students and employed 5,460 teachers. The effect of the Bantu Education Act in South Africa is apparent in a drastic shrinkage in the number of church schools there; some churches retain a few of their schools, others have none left. In other parts of Africa losses are balanced by increases and no clear trend is discernible, unless lack of growth in school figures is itself significant.

Figures for baptized membership showed a decline in several churches, possibly due to reporting technicalities. The churches whose 1954 figures were available for comparison showed an overall increase of 2 %. A small Ethiopian group doubled its membership, a reflection of the awakening movement afoot there. Membership in the strictly segregated Union grew no more slowly than in other areas. A 2 % growth is scarcely larger than normal population increase, and the fact is that well over half of 1955's accessions came through infant baptism, not adult conversion; in some large churches the proportion was four or six to one. Once cannot but be concerned at the apparent lack of evangelistic vitality in most of the African churches, or at the growing resistance of the non-Christian population. Has the salt lost its savor? This is a question, of course, which must be raised on other continents as well.

### Latin America

A glance at the statistics below show a situation in Latin America that is quite different from those treated above. There are groups or churches in 17 countries (Puerto Rico, as a United States dependency, is excluded). Three LWF member churches include 543,002 members. Fifteen other groups are related to the LWF.

Country	Churches or Groups	Baptized Membership	Notes
Cuba	1	378	Missouri Synod mission.
Mexico	5	2,937	Estimated 1954 figures include German and Scandinavian language groups and
			ALC home mission district.
Guatemala	1	887	Missouri Synod Mission.
El Salvador	1	50	Estimated. Immigrant Lutherans.
Costa Rica	1	100	Estimated. Immigrant Lutherans.

Country	Churches or Groups	Baptized Membership	Notes
Panama	1	123	Missouri Synod mission.
Colombia	2	2,406	Estimated. Includes foreign and Spanish language groups.
Venezuela	2	2,360	Estimated. Includes foreign and Spanish language groups.
British Guiana	1	7,288	Church related to ULCA mission.
Brazil	2	607,003	The Synodal Federation (1954:514,245 members) is an LWF member. Other Lutherans belong to Missouri Synod's Brazil district.
Paraguay	1	404	Missouri Synod mission
Uruguay	2	266	Missouri and National Lutheran Coun- cil missions.
Argentina	3	50,684	The Iglesia Evangelica Luterana (3,759 members) is an LWF member. To right and left are Missouri's Argentina district and the German La Plata Synod (30,000 members).
Chile	2	25,088	The Deutsche Evangelische Kirche (1954: 25,000 members) is an LWF member. There is also a Missouri Synod mission.
Bolivia	1	115	World Mission Prayer League.
Peru	1	1,200	Recent immigrant congregations.
Ecuador	2	403	Immigrant and WMPL groups.
	20	701,692	

Some 97 % of Latin American Lutherans are found in the three ABC countries, Argentina, Brazil and Chile, which have perhaps absorbed a similar proportion of German immigration to Latin America. These immigrant churches occupy a position somewhat similar to that of many North American churches a generation or two ago—they minister to communities only partly assimilated, using the German rather than the local language, and are a cultural as well as religious home to their people, but are for that very reason limited in their outreach. Nevertheless the Missouri Synod related church in booming Brazil reported a 15 % growth (to 92,760) over the year 1955. Comparative figures for other large groups are not available. In a number of countries the LWF's Committee on Latin America is gathering groups of more or less recent immigrants, the foundations for indigenous churches in the future.

Latin America is also a growing mission area for North American churches, and in this kind of work, among Indian tribes or formal Roman Catholics, Lutheranism finds much more difficulty gaining a foothold. In Colombia Roman Catholic persecution has been bitter—but the church has grown. In Bolivia work among Indians fifteen years old counts 115 members.

Several comments may be made on statistics for the whole vast area under study.

Sunday Schools, which are an important means of establishing contact with unchurched children (and their parents) as well as training Christian children, showed no growth during the year 1955, the total of 249,000 students in Africa and Asia being almost identical with the 1954 figure.

Medical work, on the other hand, showed some expansion, perhaps because of more complete reporting. In Africa and Asia 89 hospitals and 208 dispensaries and clinics treated over 1,700,000 patients. Nurses were trained in 27 schools with 677 students. Forty charitable institutions cared for the aged and orphans, the blind, the lame and those suffering from leprosy.

Widespread relief and welfare work is impossible to express in simple figures.

In the field of publications 14 church or mission-owned presses are reported. The sixty-five periodicals reported is an incomplete list and the publication of 132 new pieces of literature—books and pamphlets—is far from the true total. Volume of book sales cannot be estimated. The Lutheran Publishing House in Madagascar alone did \$ 60,000 worth of business. Yet the uncomfortable impression remains that in the field of Christian writing, literature production, and reading, the younger churches are not meeting the demands of this generation of the printed word.

Arne Sovik

## Theology

### When Books become Men...

First International Congress for Luther Research, Aarhus, Denmark, August 1956.

The book-lined room of a large library can make a peculiar impression upon the person who uses it. It is as though he were walking around in a mausoleum of human aspirations and of the human spirit. Anyone who knows this feeling will experience a particular joy when in addition to a book he also encounters its author. This happened in many cases at Aarhus and was mentioned with justifiable gratitude to the institutions and persons who had made it possible.

The invitation was issued by the Commission on Theology of the Lutheran World Federation. Now the planning and carrying out of such a conference is naturally prejudiced when such a task is undertaken by an organization which is not primarily academic in orientation and character, and one is tempted to suspect that this would have had its effect on the program and content of the conference. But it must be admitted that the danger was recognized and, for this reason, for the most part avoided. One could hardly—at least in principle-be more open to the vital yet dangerous risk of scholarship than was Bishop Hanns Lilje, President of the Lutheran World Federation, in his words of greeting. This readiness to come to terms with Luther himself, to meet him face to face, made this prejudice appear largely unfounded. We hope that this attitude may prove beneficial for the planned continuation of the work of the Congress and that the readiness of those who organized the Congress to be open-minded in their attitude towards Luther himself may be taken in good faith.

The tasks which faced the Congress can be divided into two main groups: surveys of the present extent of interest in Luther and contributions to individual themes of Luther research as such.

Taking this order, we must deal first of all with the basis of all work on Luther, the state of the Weimar Edition of Luther's works. A report on this was given by the Chairman of the Commission on the Edition Luther's Works, Professor Hanns Rückert of Tübingen. He concentrated on that which is already on the point of completion and on the tasks still to be performed. In the first category is the completion of the section on the German Bible, whose problems are the least difficult because of the fact that in Hans Volz the Commission has been able to maintain the services of an editor who works expertly and quickly. The philological and theological notes on the text of this section are to be revised, insofar as this has not already been done, by Johannes Hempel and Fritz Hahn and are to be produced in special volumes, in order not to delay the appearance of the text volumes. The completion of the work on the section "Letters" is also in sight. Most impressive was the presentation of the problems, difficulties and results emerging from the work on the first lectures on the Psalms, which is being done principally by Gerhard Ebeling of Zürich. Of scarcely less general interest was the news that plans for a new printing of the Weimar Edition are being seriously considered. We use the occasion of this report to pass on an urgent request of Rückert's which arose inevitably when the general index and the volume of addenda were mentioned. Every user of the Weimar Edition who has recorded in his notes or other material (including works already published) corrections or supplementary historical comments (including for example newly recognized Bible references) is asked

to inform the Chairman in this regard (Apfelberg 15, Tübingen, Germany).

Surveys on the state of Luther research or work on Luther were given from various countries, namely Scandinavia (E. Thestrup Pedersen-Lunde, Fyn, Denmark), Italy (Waldo Vinay-Rome), the United States (George W. Forell-University of Iowa), England (Gordon Rupp-Cambridge), France (Theobald Suss-Paris), Germany (Walther von Loewenich-Erlangen). In the report on Scandinavian Luther research the presentations of Prenter's Spiritus Creator and the opinions of his opponents understandably occupied the foreground; similar emphasis is to be found in Vilmos Vajta's work on Luther's theology of worship.

The report on Luther research in Italy was concerned particularly of course with Catholic interest in Luther. It was especially remarkable that even Italian free-thinkers are still influenced by typically Italian and

Roman Catholic points of view.

A very vivid picture was presented on theological and secular Luther research in the United States. The time during which even the energy of theologians had to be concentrated directly or indirectly on the building up of congregations is now being clearly followed here too by an epoch of growth in theological depth. The energy with which Luther research is taking place is impressive. We may mention as symptomatic the plan for a fifty-five volume American edition of Luther's works in translation, in which the large proportion of exegetical works is particularly striking.

Hardly less cause for rejoicing was given by the survey of French Luther research, which, though fundamentally narrower in scope, is addressing itself to substantially new questions. Apart from the dethronement of Denifle, which has been brought about in the Catholic sphere even in France, we shall especially await with intense interest the continuing work of Pastor Louis Saint-Blancat. He has concentrated particularly on the already strongly Augustinian traditional material in Gregory of Rimini and Pierre d'Ailly.

In regard to England it was on the one hand described as characteristic that "the last ten years have produced more English books on Luther than previous centuries", but on the other hand it was stated that one could speak of "a woolen curtain of English (perhaps even Anglican) self-complacency

in regard to the continental Reformers". Certainly this critical judgment could not have been made, had not Watson and Rupp. for example, already shown that this curtain conceals something worthy of consideration. In anticipation of the second series of lectures let us mention here that in this connection it was one of the most interesting events, at any rate for the present writer, to hear Canon James Atkinson of Leicester on the significance of St. John's Gospel for Luther. He made it clear how an Anglican gains access to Luther, starting out from St. John, from the christology of the early church, from the eucharist. Of course, several criticisms arose (which however showed no understanding for the specific fascination and stimulus of this approach), especially since the question must be asked whether Luther must not after all be described as "Pauline". since this is how he described himself. Nevertheless the stress on the way in which St. John was determinative for Luther's theology of the incarnation and his conception of the Word remain valid.

The German report was confined understandably to a survey of German Luther research and interpretation since 1945, with critical reports primarily on the fundamental approach of individual interpreters.

At this point we should mention that reports were given on the work of the Luther-Gesellschaft (by Wilhelm Maurer of Erlangen) and on that of the Luther-Akademie (by Rudolf Hermann of Berlin), movements which can be characterized only in a wider sense as being significant for Luther research.

The chief stress of the conference lay on the four main subjects which the conveners had set for it. Their treatment came as the central point of each full working day. At least two main lectures were given on each theme.

The expositions of Heinrich Bornkamm (Heidelberg) and Roland Bainton (Yale) dealt with the problems of Luther biography. Bormkamm gave expression to the justified regret that we do not possess a modern Luther biography which has really elaborated the results which have come to light since the work of Köstlin-Kawerau. But at the same time it became clear in his report that we shall probably have no adequate biography of Luther in the foreseeable future. For what significant questions

do not still require clarifying? The real "young Luther", the "old" Luther, the psychological background of his nature and of his reactions, the scope of his education, and also his attitude to the traditional educational material, whether from antiquity or church history, as well as his relations with those nearest to him: Käthe, Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Amsdorf—so many themes and names, so many desiderata.

A vivid illustration of the difficulties which face the biographer in regard to the material and also because of the limits of the tasks wich are imposed upon him was given by Bainton's presentation for example in regard to the question as to whether Luther was first placed under the ban of the empire or of the church-a typical example of the problem of the biographer who often has to report on the results of his research, without being able, because of lack of space, to prove them. Other details underlined further problems which we face in seeking an exact understanding of Luther, above all the fact that the whole wealth of circumstances surrounding Luther's statements has even yet by no means come to light.

The man for whom this question presents the most acute difficulties at this time, but who for his part is making the greatest progress towards their solution, is of course Gerhard Ebeling of Zürich. In the framework of the second group of themes, on Luther's understanding of the Scriptures, he demonstrated, taking as his example Luther's exegesis of the 45th Psalm, what were the characteristic features of Luther's interpretation. These stand out particularly when contrasted with the position of earlier interpreters consulted by Luther. The result is Luther's striking interest on the one hand in an interpretation of the event of incarnation with the aid of the exegesis of the passage in question, and on the other hand in the ever-present event of revelation, which takes place through the Word, understood as Gospel. At the same time it becomes clear that through the event of the cross, reality acquires two completely contrasting aspects. The aim of this interpretation of Luther's is to make the truth of these aspects apparent to faith: to unmask the glory of this world as its very opposite, and on the other hand to show forth the inglorious form of the kingdom of Christ as its true glory.

Ruben Josefson of Uppsala took up the same problem in a larger framework which systematized Luther's thought. He showed how the proclamation of Christ controls Luther's interpretation of Scripture, also in the sense that Luther can place Christ super, even contra scripturam.

The third set of themes concerned Luther's doctrine of sanctification, which was treated by Regin Prenter of Aarhus and Philip Watson of Cambridge. In Prenter's lecture one of the principal insights of his work Spiritus Creator was once more emphasized. Sanctification belongs to justifying faith in Christ. Unless faith is fully and constantly in effect there can be no real driving out of sin, but that faith cannot exist without sin's being driven out. The stronger the fides Christi, the more profound the sanctification.

Watson's lecture made it clear that a certain consensus has been reached here. Therefore he was especially interesting, because his real public, the persons he was addressing, were Methodists as well as Anglo-Catholics, with their prejudice that Luther had no doctrine of sanctification. This is the particular front in which an English Methodist reads Luther. It was therefore to some extent indicative that Watson's answer to the question as to which of the two main languages of the conference he would use for his lecture was, "It is my task to let Luther speak English..."

The two final lectures had as their subject Luther's view of the church, and in fact Luther's first and last great lectures provided the material. Wilhelm Maurer of Erlangen investigated the Dictata super psalterium of 1513/1515 in regard to the problem of the relationship of church and history, or more precisely, in regard to the christological foundation of the concept of the church. The form of the church in history is in its peculiarity as a corpus mixtum, a mixed body, a consequence of the incarnation, which encompasses the whole of mankind, even unbelievers. What was especially important for Maurer in this context was the emphasis on doctrinal continuity with the ancient church, a continuity in which, he claimed, Luther stood, in spite of all his individuality. The strongest misgivings were voiced in regard to the

conclusions of this lecture. The chief objections were essentially of the same kind. In regard to form it was shown that the passages selected derived from traditional thought and did not demonstrate what was peculiar to Luther in these lectures. With regard to content it was stressed that in the Dictata Luther had not yet acquired the insight that Christ encounters us in his Word, and that the asserted degree of precedence given by Luther to christology as over against ecclesiology did not apply.

Jaroslav Pelikan of Chicago spoke on the church according to Luther's lectures on Genesis. In his method he was guided by the demand not only to determine in each case Luther's attitude to the problems of the moment from his polemical writings, but also to trace Luther's attitude in his exegetical works. Thus he investigates the lectures on Genesis in regard to Luther's view of the relationship of the church and Israel-the relationship of the true and the false church in view of conflicts with the Catholics-and in regard to his statements on the ministry, Word and sacrament in view of conflicts with the Enthusiasts. It became very clear to what extent Luther's polemic of the moment was bound up with his exegetical work. Obviously each influenced the other. It likewise became clear that the most violent and unsatisfactory of Luther's exegetical experiments are to be found in connection with these questions.

One of the lectures which had been planned was not given, the one on the further tasks of Luther research. And for many reasons it was good that this was so. It will hardly be possible to make plans in this respect-Luther is much too live a subject for that. One could though exchange information as to "who", for example, is planning to treat "which" theme, so that duplication of work is avoided. But even here one comes up against difficulties, since it cannot be said whether a person will finish, nor whether each really arrives at the same conclusion. At any rate one can plan the tasks involved in bringing out editions, and related matters. These questions receded somewhat into the background, however, a characteristic symptom of the situation, which was deplored at times (v. Loewenich). But they were nevertheless treated clearly as of secondary importance, apart of course from the great

editions now planned. Certain tangible organizational results were arrived at in the question of translation into modern languages. In special consultations it was decided that persons in the individual countries should be commissioned to compile bibliographies of translations which have appeared in their own linguistic field. The aim of this survey is to enable one to refer to already existing material, perhaps even to works in another language, when making fresh revisions.

A continuation of the work of the Congress was held to be desirable with a view to the possibility of repeating it in 1958—and that too is good. One can always publish essays and take note of them when printed (the lectures given at Aarhus are to appear as soon as possible). But one cannot provide a substitute for the personal impression made by a lecturer, much less for the discussions (not to mention the conversations), which completely elude communication through reporting and the printed word, but which are probably just as significant and fruitful as the program itself.

Ernst Kähler

### Theological Education in India

This year I had an opportunity for the first time to experience the theological situation in the younger churches. In this way the horizons of our theological work in the Department have been widened to include Asia. Later I had the special privilege of attending a conference on theological education in Bangkok (Thailand). This gave me the rare advantage of meeting theological educators from Southeast Asia and becoming familiar with their problems. I should now like to report some of my experiences.

Theological work in Asia is closely related to the ministry of the church. Proclamation of the Word, especially in its evangelistic task on the missionary field, is the point of orientation for theological enterprise. Theology is more a part of the work of the church in Asia than anywhere else. Its primary task is to train for the ministry.

<sup>\*</sup> From the Annual Report of the Department of Theology of the Lutheran World Federation.

Therefore, it is more than just teaching or research. Theology is being developed in the midst of the worshiping community of the theological school. From the beginning to the end of the year students are consciously educated and trained to take their place as theologians in the life of the church.

The responsibility of the churches for theological education is founded in the denominational pattern of the theological education. This is especially true for the Lutheran churches. In all parts of Asia Lutherans have set up their theological schools for the training of their ministry. At the same time these schools reflect the Western pattern of theological education. Scandinavian, German, Dutch, English, and American methods are the norms for the different schools. Quite naturally, this creates many problems for a unified Asian theological enterprise. Some churches have developed what are called Bible schools. Actually, these have the lowest requirements, although they give right for ordination in certain churches. Other institutions, which are called "theological schools," have higher requirements for registration and at the end of the prescribed course give a special degree, L.Th. (license of theology). These schools offer instruction in the indigenous Indian languages. The theological colleges, giving the highest degree, B.D. (Bachelor of Divinity), use the English language, since students come to these colleges from all over India. Serampore University, to which all theological colleges offering the B.D. course in India are affiliated, also offers a doctor's degree. However, this has seldom been given, as Asians usually take their graduate study in Western schools.

The demand for cooperation on the missionary field has also raised the question of interdenominational cooperation. Actually, most of the schools offering B.D. or similar degrees are working on an interdenominational basis. In India, Serampore University is the only institution which can grant a B.D. Therefore other schools in the country giving courses for the B.D. must be affiliated with Serampore. This means control and unification both in the qualifications of the teachers and the standard of the degrees given. In the last few years there has been an urgent demand for interdenominational schools under the influence of the ecumenical movement. Lutheran theological schools have hesitated following this pattern. Their best schools in India are affiliated with Serampore University, but instruction is given in separate denominational schools. Gurukul Theological College has recently been established for preparing for this B. D. degree.

The need for scholarly theology is evident in India. Firstly, it is needed for the sake of the proclamation of the Gospel. It seems to be very unsatisfactory for the training of the ministry if only devotional or semi-scientific literature is offered instead of well-grounded theological literature. It was pointed out to me by a Lutheran missionary that the Lutheran church has a great task in India. It needs to provide theological literature of high standard, especially in the field of exegesis and biblical theology. The lack of adequate theological literature is more apparent on the field in India than one would think from the West.

It is therefore evident that my last year's plea to support theological literature in minority churches should be most emphatically applied to the churches in Asia and Africa. To make some basic books available at least in each field of theological study is urgently needed. It could be planned to have a series of theological textbooks published for this purpose.

The challenge of non-Christian religions and the social change in Asia is a second factor when understanding the need of a good, sound theology. The resurgent Asian religions, especially Hinduism in India, sometimes blame Christianity for being a Western product. As such, they also claim its inferiority to Asian religions. They interpret Western materialism as a result of Christianity. Through its dogma of incarnation Christianity gives quite the opposite picture of the created world than the interpretation of the Asian religions. Therefore, in India Christian theologians are convinced that the greatest task for Asia today would be to meet resurgent Asian religions on the scientific level. This would mean careful study of these religions and an adequate formulation of the Christian message, which would give access to the salvation in Christ to the Indian people.

This raises the problem of a systematic approach to the non-Christian religions in the form in which they are now represented. Problems of natural theology, religious

truth, etc., are actual problems in this respect. That such urgent needs have not been met seems to be one of the omissions of the Christian enterprise in India. The time of the first missionaries, who by translating the Bible into the Indian languages opened up the channels to Indian culture, was soon over. The wide humanistic interest of the Ziegenbalgs, Schwartzs and Careys was soon replaced by the interest of establishing churches and fostering a kind of introverted Christian theology without actually confronting the non-Christian religions. It is one of the most promising signs for the church in India that it has become conscious of the failure of a Christian cast-theology. The Lutheran Theological College and Research Institute in Madras, Gurukul, is one evidence of this proud fact. Gurukul has made plans for study of the Asian religions as they affect the Christian message to Asian people.

Such theological undertaking in Asia will certainly make the witness of the Christian church more evident to the Asian scene. It will also strengthen the evangelistic task of the church. One of the dangers in modern India is the plea for "silent witness" of the church. Appreciation for the social and educational contributions of the Christian church to India is very common. Some Christians think, therefore, in the presentday situation the door for the Gospel to India would more easily be opened by Christian activity than by the evangelistic witness of the church. The latter could present too much of a challenge and create irritation in an environment where tolerance is the key word for the "religious" man.

These factors also underline the necessity for an indigenous Indian theology. Consciousness of the truth of this claim seems to be more and more widely accepted. However, little has been done for implementing such plans. The initiative of indigenous Indian theologians is needed here. It would also require more planning for theological study in India than in the West. Indigenous theology cannot be developed from the West or by theologians who have received their graduate training exclusively at Western universities. It would nevertheless present for Indians the problem of placing less value on having a degree from the West.

Study abroad or at home? This seems to be one the basic decisions for the future of Indian theology. Certainly one should not make an "either-or" of this problem. Study in the West can be helpful; but there should be a change of emphasis in the general trend of sending graduate students to the West. First, Indians should use the higher education offered in India as long as possible. After having made use of such sources, then they should be considered for study in the West. It is amazing to learn of the tremendous amount of money which is spent for scholarships abroad. One of the theological colleges in India has been able to send nearly 50 % of its graduates for advanced study in the West. If only one half of that amount could have been used in India, the task of developing an indigenous theology could be more than just a need. It could have been used to strengthen and to assist existing institutions within India for the benefit of the church.

In this context the task of Gurukul becomes clear. One could refer to the shifting emphasis in the missionary enterprise in India. The movement from mission to church is an established fact. The question now is in which direction the assistance of the West is still needed in bringing the Gospel to India. One could wish that the Indians themselves would take complete charge of the primary evangelistic work. They would in the indigenous languages more easily gain the confidence of the Indians and find the correct approach. Western assistance is definitely needed in the field of theological education. In spite of the good opportunities for training their students in the West, most of the Indian schools have limited personnel resources. As teachers alone, the Indians need a number of highly qualified theologians from the mother churches. It should be emphasized that a good teacher in India must have the highest qualifications. If there is any task as challenging for a future call to serve the church for a young scholar from the West, it would be to become a theological teacher in Asia. The staff of Gurukul is half Indian, half Westerner. Here they should be able to produce teamwork where the fruits of Western theology are made available to the Indian church and its theology. However, their task should not only be training for the ministry. At the same time they should assist in training

ministers, offering them theological courses. etc. Quite naturally, these theological tasks would demand an increased staff. But is it too much to hope that the assistance of Western churches to India would focus to a greater extent on theologically qualified persons to meet these needs? Would it not also be possible in the near future to have a theological secretary in India, who would coordinate theological enterprise and the assistance of Western theologians? At the Bangkog conference in February in a meeting with Lutheran delegates, it was seriously suggested to me that the Department of Theology send a staff member for a year or so to Asia for the purpose of finding out the theological needs of that part of the world. It is neither optimistic nor Lutheran self-sufficiency to say that Lutheran theology could contribute greatly to a new phase in the life of the Indian church. Rethinking missions in Asia should put proper emphasis Vilmos Vajta on this theological task.

### World Service

### Open Doors and Major Decisions

A church organization as well as a business organization has to learn to take advantage of opportunities when the time is ripe—to "strike while the iron is hot" according to an old English proverb dating back to the days of blacksmithy. This is exactly what the Commission on World Service meant to do in regard to its program of aid to Eastern Europe when it increased its budget for this area during the August meeting in London.

This new opportunity for Western churches to aid their brethren in East European countries can be directly traced to the change in course taken by the 20th Party Congress in Moscow early this year when Stalin was abruptly "de-canonized". During the World Service sponsored conference for Minority Lutheran Churches in Semmering, Austria last March, delegates from Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary were optimistic about closer contacts with the Western churches because of the politically warmer atmosphere between East and West. Not long after this, invitations from

the Czechoslovakian and Polish Lutheran churches were received by LWF leaders for them to visit these countries, observe their church life and acquaint their members with Lutheran churches in other lands. In Hungary, the case of Bishop Ordass was re-opened by the state after eight years and the verdict reversed from his trial in 1948 when he was "found guilty" of currency violations despite the obvious falsity of such a charge. In Warsaw, the state returned Holy Trinity Lutheran Church to its rightful owners after keeping the building since 1950. These are signs of the political times and World Service wants to take advantage of the possibilities.

"We do not know how long the doors to these countries will remain open, but we must do what we can to help our friends in Eastern Europe while the situation is favorable", was the consensus of the Commission members when they voted a \$25,000 increase in the program budget for the present fiscal year. The money was made available "as an experiment" with the future of the program depending on how successfully it is carried on during the coming few months.

The need for an increase in aid to Lutheran churches in Eastern European countries has long been apparent but no secure method for sending quantity goods had been evolved. Up to the present, aid in the form of medicines, food, literature and occasionally used clothing-to-order had been sent in packages to specific needy persons recommended by pastors. In recent months, all of these have arrived at their destinations (so far as is possible to check) and more have been sent. The letters of appreciation received by LWF workers from the recipients indicate how valuable such aid has been and how much it is still needed.

Now there is reason to believe that larger shipments of relief goods could be sent to some of the countries with government permission and the possibility of LWF supervision on the distribution. Reports from these countries indicate this although there is no guarantee how long the situation will last. To other countries, the indirect method will continue to be used but increased.

Shortly after the Semmering conference, the Department asked the Rev. John Warnes (American), in Europe on a special World Service commission, to conduct a detailed study of the package-sending program and evaluate the possibilities of expansion. In a six-week period he visited Vienna, Stuttgart, Berlin and London and talked with officials of other voluntary agencies involved in this type of aid (i. e. World Council of Churches, Evangelisches Hilfswerk) as well as LWF workers in making his report. In his final recommendations, he suggested that a special office be established to handle the increased program and explore the possibilities of sending aid to such countries as Russia, the Baltic States, Rumania and Bulgaria as well as the present three-Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. He also emphasized the urgency of the cause:

"It seems appropriate to stress the urgency of what is not less than a life and death matter for many people. Failure to enter doors while they are open may find them closed when at last it is decided to venture. The hope generated by even a small delivery of help through cleared avenues may hardly be calculated as to ultimate results. Nothing less than the earliest, the best and the most will suffice for the alleviation of all possible suffering in the present hour", he wrote.

The job of supervising the increased program was turned over to the Rev. Mogens Zeuthen, LWF/World Service Secretary for Minority Lutheran Churches. His task in this field is three-fold:

 a. continuing and enlarging the present World Service program of sending individual relief parcels;

commencing service to new fields where possible;

c. serving as a "clearing agent" for all Lutheran agencies and individuals wishing to send aid into Eastern Europe. This would particularly fulfill a need of relatives in the West who want to help their families in the homeland and do not know how to send packages. (Persons interested in further information concerning this possibility are asked to contact LWF headquarters.)

The Commission on World Service also decided during the London meeting that Pastor Zeuthen should turn all of his attention to the important LWF contacts with Eastern Europe. At the suggestion of the

LWF Commission on Stewardship and Congregational Life, a new executive will be appointed to the Department early in 1957 who will be responsible for the minority Lutheran church contacts in Western Europe and for an enlarged program of aid in the field of stewardship service to all European churches. This will leave Pastor Zeuthen free for his work in Eastern Europe. Another major but more unexpected decision at the London meeting was to sharply reduce the Department's large resettlement program with the end of the present fiscal year (May, 1957) rather than to wait another year. The Geneva resettlement office will remain open to handle residual cases and adequate finances will be available should World Service be asked to aid resettlement agencies of member churches, such as the German and Austrian Hilfswerk, next year. However, Department resettlement offices in Germany, Austria, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Venezuela will be closed. The office in Australia was left open pending further discussion during a Commission meeting next March.

The decision was based on reports that such a large emergency resettlement program was no longer needed and that its continuation would often "cause embarrassment to the Federation and to Lutheran resettlement offices in countries of immigration." It was reported that an increasing percentage of "refugee" emigrants consist of families already well-integrated into European life who only seek better positions through emigration to America or Canada or elsewhere. Those who really need help from a church agency could be aided by the Geneva office, the Commission felt.

Since 1948, when the LWF resettlement program began, through August of this year, the Federation has sponsored individually exactly 69,400 migrants with approximately 80 per cent of these coming from Germany. Before April, 1957, an expected 8,500 more will be helped to resettle abroad before the German and Austrian offices close.

Mainly because of the reduced resettlement program, the 1957—58 budget set up by the Commission in London is approximately \$150,000 less than the present and past fiscal years. The total "A" or

"core" budget was set at about \$ 550,000 with the final figure to be decided on next March when more information for certain requests is available. For the present year (1956—57), the "A" budget was set at \$ 708,041 and for the past year (1955—56), the budget was \$ 667,415. The "A" budget is assured of coverage and contains those items most necessary for continuance of a World Service aid program to the 20 countries involved.

The total "B" or "special project" budget for 1957—58 was set at approximately \$800,000. This figure is about \$50,000 lower than for the previous two years. The "B" budget has never been completely covered, generally only three-fourths of the requested amount is picked up by LWF National Committees who select specific projects for their support.

In other actions during the London meeting, the Commission decided to:

1. Include as a "B" project for 1957-58, a "Capital Expenditure Grant" of \$ 37,500 for the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia (UELCA) for aid towards a major church building program to meet the needs created by the influx of so many Lutheran immigrants in the past five years. This same amount will be included in the World Service budgets for Australia during the following two fiscal years, reaching a total amount of \$ 112,500 by 1960 which is to be matched dollar for dollar by the UELCA. They will use this aid and their own contributions as a revolving Loan Fund enabling their congregations to erect the necessary buildings for carrying on an adequate spiritual ministry program among the new Australians. It is expected that this item will be covered as a "B" project.

Along with the Fund, the Commission was asked to provide the UELCA with a man in the field of Stewardship and Evangelism for a one-year or at the most, a two-year period to assist the church in raising its share of the Fund. This man, who will probably be an American, will begin his work there next year. 2. Provide necessary funds (\$ 8,600 in two

2. Provide necessary funds (\$ 8,600 in two years) for the translation of the major works of Martin Luther into French by a committee from the French Lutheran churches beginning this year. 3. Include as a "B" project, an item for \$ 10,000 to provide for one professor, probably an American, to teach systematics at Cambridge in England. This will enable Lutheran theology students in England to be trained at home.

4. Appoint a representative resident in India, the Rev. John G. Steinhoff from the Board of Foreign Missions of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, to supervise the relief distribution program of Lutheran World Service in India beginning immediately. Pastor Steinhoff lives in Madras and will serve half-time for the Board of Foreign Missions and half-time for the National Christian Council of India with his chief concern being for relief needs in Lutheran mission fields.

5. Rejected the Department's proposal for beginning a World Service relief and welfare project in Taiwan (Formosa) on the grounds that it did not have enough funds for starting what could grow into a very large program and also that other agencies were expected to meet most of the needs increasing their work.

6. Rejected the Department's proposal for beginning a World Service spiritual ministry program among settlers in South Africa because the request did not come through the Department of World Missions and there was not adequate information about it. The project will again be discussed at the next Commission meeting in March 1957.

 Welcomed the Rev. Bengt Hoffman as the new Director of the Department of World Service. His election by the LWF Executive Committee was announced at the meeting.

 Appointed the Rev. Vernon Frazier, pastor of St. Mary's Lutheran Church in London, to serve as the World Service representative in England until more permanent arrangements could be made.

9. The Comission also decided to meet again in Hamburg during March to discuss further policy matters and review more closely its present program. Included in the new agenda will be items on the possibilities of aid to migrants, the Exchange Program, the Department's responsibilities at the 1957 Assembly and other related matters.

A. Jean Olson

### FROM LANDS AND CHURCHES

### India

### Missionary Work in India

A report which has been issued by a Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Madhya Pradesh Government has received wide publicity throughout India. It is indeed a radical criticism by a reactionary group, but it has elicited strong condemnation from progressive national leaders. Its origin may be traced to certain discussions that followed Premier Nehru's visit to Nagaland.

### The Naga Situation

The Nagas, a Mongolian tribe inhabiting the hilly border between India and Burma, had set up a Naga National Council to demand that the Nagas, living mostly in the Indian Union, be allowed to constitute themselves into a separate state. This was manifestly a fantastic demand. The British officials of pre-Independence days were doubtless a party to the creation of this agitation on the eve of British withdrawal from India. American missionaries who had close social contacts with the then British officials were also considered to be a party to this. British officials having left Naga territory, American missionaries were the only foreigners still in Nagaland, and evidently their presence did not help the situation.

Accordingly Prime Minister Nehru visited Nagaland in March 1953 along with Premier U Nu of Burma, as some Nagas were living on the Burmese side of the border. With his natural sympathy for and appreciation of this people with their many attractive qualities, Nehru was not only able to win over a large body of opinion to see the absurdity of the demand, but he also worked out a scheme for the betterment not only of the Nagas but also of all the other tribes inhabiting the vast area consisting mostly of the sparsely inhabited, wild, mountainous North-East Agency, which is being administered not by the Governor-in-Council but only by the Governor as the agent of the President of the Indian Union with the help of an adviser, an official of the Central Government and his staff.

When the Indian Premier made a statement in Parliament in April 1953, he made it clear that the main problem was the political problem of integrating Nagas into the life of the rest of India. In the context of the old India, they had led their own isolated life, and the immediate problem was to provide this very backward area with educational, medical and other facilities and help rapid social progress. One of his minor recommendations was that with a view to helping forward this integration with India, it would be necessary not to allow foreign missionaries to work in this area. Though in free India missionaries stood lovally by their pledge to the government, they could not as foreigners effectively promote this integration.

At Kohima, the headquarters of Naga Hills, one of the Districts under the government of Assam, the Premier stated that the exclusion of foreign missionaries from this area was purely for political reasons and that Indian missionaries would be welcome, and they could be proper ambassadors to make the tribal people appreciate Indian life and culture and the manifest advantages of being a part of the great Indian nation.

Contrary to the Premier's intention, certain reactionary groups in India sought to take advantage of this particular statement in regard to the exclusion of foreign missionaries from this tribal area to demand that foreign missionaries be excluded from all parts of India. Those responsible for this view were the communalists against whom Nehru has constantly been fighting. They were the persons who did not appreciate Gandhi's effort to promote harmony among followers of all religions, and his life was sacrificed at the altar of national unity as against inter-communal discord.

The questions raised on account of the government's decision to exclude foreigners from the Naga Hills and North-East Frontier Agency encouraged reactionary forces to exert pressure on the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh to get a state government committee appointed to inquire into missionary activities within his state. Accordingly

in April 1953 a committee of three was appointed, with Dr. M. B. Nivogi, retired Chief Justice of Madhya Pradesh, as chairman. There was a great deal of misgiving about this committee, with the result that it never functioned. In April 1954 fresh action was taken appointing the three who were to constitute the committee according to the Government Order of April 1053 with an Indian Christian and a representative of the Hindu Mahasabha. It was unfortunate that Professor S. K. George of Wardha Commercial College was selected as the Christian representative on the committee, though it was known that he had ceased to be a professing Christian, his attitude to Jesus being the same as that of Gandhi. His appointment and that of the Mahasabha representative deepened the fear that this would not be an impartial committee of inquiry.

The Madhya Pradesh government has been watching the progress of Christian work especially in the new areas formerly ruled by Indian princes and now integrated into Madhya Pradesh. The communalists' influence in Madhya Pradesh is rather strong, and it was a great pity that the government launched upon this inquiry with persons known not to be neutral; even the chairman's pronouncements before he served on the committee had been challenged in the press. It is no wonder that the report that was issued on July 17, 1956 has been widely criticized as a reactionary document.

When American missionaries were removed from the Naga area, a Naga national, the Rev. Long Ai, who had taken his theological training at Serampore, went in as a missionary into new Naga areas. In May 1955 when the Assam Gospel Team organized by the Christian Endeavor Society and sponsored by the Assam Christian Council visited Madras, it was reported that this Naga missionary had within two years gathered 10,000 adherents from new subtribes of the Nagas. This spontaneous action of the Naga church has not come under any criticism, but the conversion of about 5,000 Uraons in the Surguja District and a smaller number of people in the Raigarh District has come in for adverse remarks not only in regard to what has happened in Madhya Pradesh but in regard to Christian missionary activity in India as a whole.

### Madhya Pradesh Agitation

In 1948 the fairly large state of Surguja and the smaller states of Korea and Changbakar were integrated into the Governor's state of Madhya Pradesh and were constituted into the Surguja District of the said state. Similarly Udaipur and Jashpur and Raigarh to the south-east were also integrated into Madhya Pradesh State. In Jashpur Christian congregations had been established even before World War I. Though at the beginning Protestant work by Gossner missionaries seemed very hopeful, the outbreak of World War I crippled the Gossner work, and the Roman Catholics went ahead, so that the Catholics in Jashpur are now nearly ten times as strong as the Lutherans.

The Constitution of the Indian Union came into effect on January 26, 1951 and, as the right to "profess, preach and propagate" one's religion has been given to all citizens of India, Christians could now go into states which had till then prohibited, or placed severe restrictions on, Christian work. The Lutheran National Missionary Society of India decided to open work among the Uraons of Surguja, making use of the Uraon personnel from the Gossner Church. The Rev. B. J. Krupadanam, a member of the Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church and a missionary of the National Missionary Society, was transferred in June 1951 to take charge of this new work, with Ambikapur, the district headquarters, as his center of mission work. Within six months he and his Uraon staff were able to contact many villages and in several places catechumens had been gathered. On December 6,1951 the first group of 59 persons was baptized; representatives of catechumens from various other villages took part in the baptism service with great joy and zest, and they joined lustily in singing Uraon songs with the new congregation.

The Lutherans have followed legitimate methods of evangelism. In every village they approached, they contacted the people, preached the Word of God and told about Jesus, the Savior of men and the Transformer of the lives of his people. The fact that our evangelists were Uraons from Ranchi and Jashpur made the Uraons of Surguja willing to give a good hearing. There were many who were unwilling to take the first step, but those that were

drawn to Jesus were given proper instruction. These simple illiterate people had the Christian message given to them not only by word of mouth but also in good moving Uraon songs. The story of the Cross and the Creed could be sung to them, and that took a deep hold of their hearts. Therefore when they confessed that Christ is the Lord and affirmed that they would never forsake this Lord of love, they meant what they stood loyally by their conviction and witnessed with courage in the midst of persecution.

The Roman Catholics have been full of zeal, but one would prefer them to go to new villages rather than appeal to people already under instruction. Naturally this competition has come in for criticism in the report. The writer was present at the baptism at Ganjadad on December 6, 1951 when the first Christian congregation in the whole of the former Surguja state was formed. The exhortation given to the new converts was that having come to be the worshipers of a holy and loving God, they should give up every evil habit, including their customary drink at their festivities, and lead clean holy lives. The Roman Church has not stood against this habit of drink as the Evangelicals do decisively. It is remarkable that in Surguja the progress of the Lutheran Church has been more rapid than that of the Roman Catholics.

Lutheran workers and Lutheran converts have suffered and have even been injured. Missionary Krupadanam prepared a statement on molestation by people and by government officials and, though it does not do full justice to this complaint, the report itself acknowledges that the Committee heard both in Surguja and in Raigarh of cases of molestation by the people and by petty government officials.

It was a great pity that the Rev. Krupadanam was seriously ill when the inquiry was conducted in June 1954. His passing away in August 1954 was a great handicap for our work, but still the work has gone on steadily though not so rapidly as in the year 1951 to 1952. Now the church in Surguja, scarcely five years old, has 3,000 Lutheran members, steadfast in faith and courageous in their witness.

When during the first year progress was fairly rapid and over 700 catechumens had been baptized by September 1952, the ex-Maharajah of Surguja found it intolerable. and he issued a pamphlet in Hindi which was widely distributed in Surguia District and the neighboring areas. It was an attack against Christian work, maintaining that people were being deceived by Christian missionaries to leave their ancestral faith and that thereby they were planning to create a hostile community which would seek separation as the Moslems of India did, with the consequence that India had to be partitioned. It was on the face of it an absurd criticism, as Christians all over India, including foreign missionaries, had backed the demand for freedom, and the National Government and national leaders have appreciated the readiness of Indian Christians to give up separate electorates brought about by the Government of India Acts passed in the later days of British rule in India. It is true that the tribal people of Chota-Nagpur and Jashpur had agitated for a separate state of Jharkand within the Indian Union, but to compare it with the attitude of the Moslem League which demanded Pakistan as a separate state for Moslems is altogether untenable.

Our national leaders and the great majority of our countrymen are more discerning. Even in regard to the Naga demand, Nehru and the present Home Minister G. B. Pant have assured the Nagas of the earnest interest of the government to help forward not only their social and economic progress, but also their desire for a larger share of administrative autonomy within the framework of the Indian Union. That would not only give them a sense of satisfaction in being primarily responsible for their own territory, but they will through their representation in the regional council and the national Parliament secure extended opportunities for participation in all the great projects of the government and the people.

Some of the main findings of the Niyogi Committee are as follows: "Evangelism in India appears to be a part of the uniform world policy to revive Christendom for reestablishing Western supremacy and is not prompted by spiritual motives. The objective is apparently to create Christian minority pockets with a view to disrupt the

solidarity of the non-Christian societies." In respect of the large sums of money received from abroad to maintain missionary activities in India, it is pointed out that 20 crores of rupees had been received by various missions in India during the three-and-a-half year period ending June 1954. Of these Rs. 24/- crores came from the United States and the other non-sterling areas while the Rs. 5/- crores came from the United Kingdom and other sterling areas. The foreign personnel number 4,877, an increase of 500 over the returns for 1951, the increase having occurred in the smaller missions, most of which do not yet have any organized churches associated with them. These figures relate to the whole of the Indian Union, but in Madhya Pradesh alone there were 251 Indian and 402 foreign missionaries. The Protestant Christian missions operating in Madhya Pradesh were conducting eight agricultural settlements, six cooperative societies, four miscellaneous industrial centers, two colleges, fifteen high schools, three teachers' training institutions and six industrial schools. Other institutions run by various missions in the state include a school for the children of missionaries, two theological colleges and seminaries, seven industrial and evangelistic workers' institutions, Christian ashram, twenty-two hospitals, five leprosy institutions, one tuberculosis sanatorium, three homes for women, one home for converts, twenty orphanages and six social and welfare organizations.

The above are the figures regarding Protestant work in Madhya Pradesh State. It has to be noted that soon after the first tour of the committee, the Roman church withdrew its cooperation and filed a suit in court that an inquiry into matters concerning religious freedom was a contravention of the Constitution. The court criticized several of the questions in the questionnaire issued by the committee as not very judicious, but it upheld the right of the government to investigate the matter under issue in a reasonable manner. The committee itself admits that it was not appointed under the Judical Inquiry Act which would have enabled it to summon witnesses and give the defense counsel the right to question the witnesses. At a wellattended public meeting of Christians held in Madras, Mr. M. Rutnaswamy, a widely appreciated critic of public affairs, and a fair, well-balanced speaker in academic circles, pointed out very scathingly that the committee did not at all deserve to be considered as a judical committee.

The committee in a very biased manner viewed Christianity as a part of the policy of the West. This accounts for its avowed antipathy to foreign missionaries and to economic support received from the West. The authors of the report have tried to exploit the present Indian opposition to military aid to Pakistan, SEATO etc. with a view to discrediting missionary activities as a whole.

The serious allegation of the committee is that conversion is brought about by undue material influence and not by conviction, especially among hill-tribes and backward communities. In the recommendations made to the government the main demand is for amending the Constitution not only to restrict to Indian nationals the right to "propagate" one's religion, but also to make conversions more difficult, and to prohibit the imparting of religious instruction to children without the explicit consent of parents or guardians. The committee demands that the government should prevent Christians from rendering medical aid or circulating literature for religious propaganda without the approval of the state government, and that the government arrange for non-governmental institutions receiving grants in aid to be inspected quarterly by state officials. The report also strongly urges that the government should have "the (sole) responsibility for providing social services like education, health services, medicine, etc. to members of scheduled tribes, castes and other backward classes." It is also urged that no non-official agency should be permitted to secure foreign assistance except through government channels and that no foreigner should be allowed to function in a scheduled or specified area either independently or as a member of a religious institution unless he had given a declaration in writing that he would not take part in politics and that programs of social and economic betterment by non-official or religious bodies should receive prior approval of the state government.

Naturally Indian Christian organizations and Christian leaders have considered the

document reactionary and counter to the Constitution of India as a free, democratic, secular state. The authors of the report seem to demand a police state that would restrict the legitimate rights of citizens.

Many non-Christians have very strongly condemned the report and their criticism of it is coupled with expressions of warm appreciation on the part of Indian nationals as a whole for the great services rendered by Christians and Christian missions in this land. The opinions of two national leaders among others may be mentioned. Dr. John Matthai, the first Financial Minister of Free India, now Vice-Chancellor of Bombay University, in a statement on the report said, "I would respectfully suggest to those in authority that it is a mistake both politically and from the point of view of India's growing prestige abroad that this should be allowed to happen... The general attack that is launched against foreign missionaries is not merely unfair but ill-founded . . . (If any are) found guilty of misconduct either in respect of India's foreign relations or in respect of inter-communal feelings, the Government have enough powers to deal with it and nobody can complain of whatever action the Government may think fit to take ... It is no justification for the vast generalizations which are sometimes made against missionaries as a whole and against the Christian Church here and abroad . . . The policy of the Government as declared by the Prime Minister more than once in Parliament and elsewhere left no room for doubt that neither the secular Government of the State nor the religious freedom guaranteed by the Constitution are in the least at stake. I have personally discussed the subject with the Prime Minister and the Home Minister and also with the Chief Minister of Bombay and I have every confidence that the rights of Christians in India as a community and as a religious organization will be fully respected."

In regard to foreign missionaries, he said, "no class of foreigners working in India during the past hundred years has by and large served the country with greater zeal and interest than missionaries. Speaking as one who, although a Christian, has watched the work of missionaries with the detached outlook of a student of public affairs, I have no hesitation in saying that

whatever their failings, these were outweighed by what they have done in the cause of building up a self-respecting and self-reliant India." He further added, "The kind of cultural and spiritual autarchy which is now advocated in certain quarters is inconsistent with the traditions and spirit of the country. The wonderful work accomplished by Buddhist missionaries in nearby Asian countries has left permanent marks on the civilization and culture of those countries. Even today missionaries of the Ramakrishna Mission are found in European countries and in America working with the zeal and disinterestedness which have earned them widespread appreciation . . . There was a time when India was a haven of refuge for people suffering religious persecution in other countries in the same way as England offered asylum to those persecuted for political reasons abroad. Surely the advent of independence is not going to leave us less and not more tolerant than we have been in the past."

Dr. Harekrushna Mahtab, Governor of Bombay, in a speech at the Bombay Y.M.C.A. said that the controversy that has been started over the activities of missionaries was "a disservice to the unsophisticated people whom we profess to serve." In regard to the Niyogi Report, the Governor regretted that "religion has been brought into the picture", and stated that it was wrong to conclude that Christian missionaries had exploited unsophisticated and uneducated people, but that the poor and the weak had been exploited rather by the strong and educated in the land. "Progress could not be achieved", he said, "by excluding any community from helping the poor and the needy. There should be competition between religions in their generosity towards the poor, and whoever is capable of helping the poor should hold the field."

Answering a question in the Madras State Legislative Council, Mr. M. Bakthavatsalam, Minister for Agriculture, said, "There was no proposal to set up a committee to inquire into the activities of missionaries in educational institutions as was done in another state in India." To a supplementary question as to whether the government would institute an inquiry if representations were made by parents, the minister stated that complaints, when

received, could be looked into by the government, and added that a complaint made from Madurai was on investigation found to be baseless.

On September 4 the Minister for Home Affairs, Mr. B. N. Datar, stated in the Lok Sabha (The House of the People) that allegations that people were forcibly converted to Christianity in certain parts of the country have proved to be baseless when inquired into by the government. He stated that the total amount of remittances received by Christian missionaries in India from all countries abroad did not exceed Rs. 0.13 crores in any one year, while that from America did not exceed Rs. 6.91 crores. This information was obtained by the government from the Reserve Bank of India. There was no restriction on remitting money to India except for investment. In reply to a question whether it was a fact that there was an increase in the anti-Indian activities of foreign Christian missionaries in India, the minister said, "There is no factual basis for the assumption made in the question, according to the information available from the government of India. The question of the government's taking steps to combat this did not, therefore, arise."

The report has, however, set Christians in India thinking. While they are fully sure that their rights guaranteed by the Constitution will be maintained, the opposition of the people as a whole to conversion is a matter for serious consideration. It is well known that Gandhi was against the adherents of one religion leaving their religious group and joining another. He, as a Hindu, was fully convinced that so far as he was concerned Hinduism fully satisfied his religious cravings. He held that "the great religions of the world, properly understood, unite in their central teachings; the rest is unessential and is mere custom and so is best left to custom undisturbed." He claimed that all scriptures were entitled to equal respect and that for him the main scripture was and should remain the Bhagavad Gita. The theory that all religions are the same puts Hinduism in a position of advantage in India. Higher Hinduism can hold its own as being the Indian form of the universal religion, and the lower forms can still be maintained as suited to the lower orders of society. Hinduism claims that while aggressive religions are guilty of arrogance, claiming that they alone have the full truth, Hinduism is a tolerant religion because of its humility.

When Gandhi says, "I regard Jesus as a great teacher of humanity but I do not regard him as the only begotten Son of God", he disregards what is basic to Christianity. This is the main issue for the Christian in India. The Christian recognizes that in the fact of the incarnation, death and resurrection of Jesus, there is a message of unique value which he cannot but share with his fellow-countrymen. In all humility the Christian has to present this to men even of the highest culture in the world. While on this matter the Christian church can and will never make a compromise, there are a few other issues that the church in India has to face.

1. The Christian stands isolated from the main current of India's life. The Indian Christian is considered to be a de-nationalized person. The intolerance of the caste system in India drove out the Christian believer from the community, and this has been an unhappy situation. Whereas in Japan, China and similar lands, the absence of the caste system made it possible for the Christian to continue to live in his own home and society, in India this was unfortunately not possible. That brought the Indian Christian into closer contact with the church, long under the patronage of the foreign missionary. On the one hand, this brought him away from the cultural environment of his own people and on the other made him susceptible to accepting opinions even in non-theological matters from the foreign missionary. As a result of this, a situation has arisen wherein the Hindu looks upon the Indian Christian as being appreciably different from himself. The Indian Christian may have acquired certain positive new qualities that have enriched his personality, but at the same time in regard to many practical and outward ways of life, he seems more or less a foreigner to the general Indian community.

The remedy is now being sought on both sides. On the one hand Christians are increasingly realizing their solidarity with the rest of India's population. In the national demand for independence, Christians

were in the main current of the great urge for freedom, and unlike the Moslems, they did nothing to embarrass India's leaders. This is important especially now, when we are facing stupendous tasks of social reconstruction. Hindu society itself is changing, as is evidenced by the great reforms inaugurated by the secular state. The immense program for social betterment is a challenge to the Christian to throw himself heart and soul into the efforts of the government which seeks the betterment of the adherents of all religions alike and which is trying to evolve a new socialistic pattern of society. It is our earnest hope that in changing India, the old divergence between the general community and the Christian will be greatly minimized.

The Christians, having been drawn mostly from down-trodden communities, have not always looked upon the higher castes of India with love and respect. The church as such has sought to nurture its members in the Word of God, and in the fundamentals of the Christian religion. But the community as a whole has not taken a deep interest in the cultural heritage of India. The great literature of Hindu India has been a sealed book to many Christians.

But more and more the very evangelistic responsibility of the Christian church drives its sons and daughters to acquire a new insight into all that is of value in the life and culture of India. In the past there have been some notable achievements. For example H. A. Krishna Pillay, a convert from Hinduism and a very learned Tamil scholar, composed a great epic based on John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress which is reckoned by all Tamil scholars as of the very highest literary merit, and he is often called the Christian Kamban (the author of Ramayana in Tamil). So also Vedanayaga Sastriar who lived earlier as a contemporary of Father C. F. Schwartz was a fine Tamil poet, and much more a composer of moving lyrics, Christian songs set to Indian music. Likewise N. V. Tilak of Maharashtra, and notable converts in various parts of India, Hindu and Moslem, have done valuable work. Today Christians drawn from scheduled castes are developing fine literary tastes, and thus a process of cultural integration is steadily proceeding. Today it is not uncommon for radio listeners to be treated to delightful Indian music by Indian Christians whose theme is not infrequently biblical. Educational institutions, defense and civil services, national programs for the cultural progress of India's people are bringing Christians and non-Christians closer together. The National Christian Council and the regional councils are eager to foster this cultural integration. The Tamilnad Christian Council has in recent years brought talented Christian writers, musicians etc. together to promote these cultural affinities which will make the church less and less foreign, and more and more related to the country.

2. The other question that is sharply raised in the Niyogi Report, and that deserves very serious consideration, is the fact that the Christian movement in India is still heavily dependent upon financial assistance from the West. Neither the older churches that give the assistance nor the younger churches that receive the assistance can be complacent about this matter. This received very earnest consideration at Whitby, when the mission task was viewed as the task of the world church and the principle of partnership in obedience was enunciated.

While it is undoubtedly true that the people of God form one indivisible ecumenic church, the relationship between the older churches and the younger ones should not be merely that of unilateral giving and receiving respectively. It ought to be the concern of the church to see that the giving and receiving are mutual. In the matter of the special charismata of God's people in various lands, the East too can make as full a contribution as the West does and is immensely blessed thereby. One may argue that there is a certain measure of mutual assistance both materially and spiritually. But India has to grow more deeply in doing her part in the sharing. There have been instances where even economically poor churches have sent remittances to the distressed churches in Europe, and that was deeply appreciated by the recipients, especially around 1923 when inflation in Germany had reached its nadir. While gifts of love have to be mutual, we have, however, to face the unfortunate situation of the West's having so much more money to give, and the undeveloped nations' having so very little.

Especially as the Christian communities in India have not been drawn from the richer classes, this disparity which is an unfortunate fact does necessitate the flow of money from the west to the east, if the church throughout the world is to function as a united family.

The church in India, which has now become responsible for all Christian work, with missionaries sharing in its activities, is carrying on extensive tasks in the field of education, medical relief etc. Many devoted Christians of the West have considered the money that they send to India and other lands as something that they are constrained to give because Christ wants them to serve not only their own advanced communities but also the underprivileged nations. When America offers financial aid to the government or certain national health and educational programs, India does not decline these gifts, provided they are given in a disinterested way without any strings attached to them. The broad fact as pointed out by the governor of Bombay is that the poor millions of India have profited enormously by these financial gifts. The church has, however, to make determined efforts to see that its own giving is multiplied tenfold and twentyfold. The motive for giving can be only a deeper sense of what we owe to God in Christ, and only a revived church with a quickened heart of love and compassion can produce more satisfactory results in this matter of growth in giving. The natural criticism from non-Christian people is not only understandable but also constitutes a real challenge to the church to become more and more devoted to its tasks with a quickened sense of stewardship.

Not only in regard to the above two criticisms but also in various other matters, the church has a great task ahead of it, if it is to be a worthy witness to the transforming power of the crucified and risen Savior. But judging the situation as a whole, Christians in India have cause for very deep gratitude that they live in a land where there is wide appreciation of works of mercy and where there is also a great tradition of tolerance and mutual respect. While not compromising in regard to the unique fact of Jesus, the incarnate, crucified and risen Lord and the peace and power that the living ascended Lord brings

to his people, the church has to become more worthy of its Lord. It has to grow in identification with the needs of the people around it and to grow also in a real spirit of love and sacrifice.

J. D. Asirvadam

## The United States

### Religion and the Industrial World

The religious forces in the United States are today making a definite impact upon the industrial world. This was not always the case. Within the past two decades, the churches of America have awakened to the mighty challenge and obligation that is theirs-in bringing both men of industry and labor under the rule of God. Before that time, these two great groups were on the whole left to find their own answers in the realm of economic justice. Many of the first labor leaders were motivated not so much by ethical principles as by lust for personal power and gain and revenge. As we view the progress in industrial harmony that has been made in America, we can but marvel that the sound judgments and moral principles of the better men in labor and industry prevailed without the direct and published concern of the forces of religion. Yet, as we study the history of the labor movement and its transition from the control of certain radical and sometimes ruthless men to the leadership of men of high ethical standards, we feel that the church, although is was not vocal in those days, did make a definite contribution through men to whom it had given a basic Christian philosophy. This may account for the fact that there is no hostility toward the church today; no great resentment that the church did not openly espouse the cause of labor with an articulate voice and with concerted action as is the case today.

During the past two decades, Lutheranism has been awakening to the issues that are involved. The fact that the Lutheran church in America before that time was mainly a rural church may account in part for the reason that we did not sooner champion the cause of economic justice. Until 1920 most Lutherans were farmers or small

business people. Relatively few worked in factories or belonged to unions or were leaders in industry. On the other hand, Catholic and Jewish immigrants clustered more in the industrial areas and became union members from the very inception of organized labor. Experience in industrial employment and first hand contacts with good unions have led our Lutherans to change their minds about organized labor. We must remember that sixty percent of union members are connected with some church. Furthermore, we realize that sixty percent of these are affiliated with some Protestant group. We feel very confident that their loyalities to Christ and his church will help point organized labor to seek legitimate goals and to recognize its responsibilities not only to the members of the union but to the entire community. We repeat-there is no breach between the forces of labor and the established church in America. Labor leaders are discovering that the church is the champion of the very rights that they are attempting to win or if already won, to retain.

To prove this point we quote at length some recent statements made by men who rank high in the lists of organized labor.

David J. McDonald, Pres. United Steelworkers, C.I.O.,

"Religion has been a consolation and a help to me in my labor activities; and by the same token my labor activities have helped me religiously, i.e, they have enabled me to help my fellow man. In the field of labor you are helped when you realize that you cannot do it all and you must leave something to God."

Jacob S.Potofsky, Gen.Pres. Amalgamated Clothing Workers, "Enlightened labor has always contended that man does not live by bread alone—religion and labor have a common goal—the realization of man's aspirations in the sight of God."

Emil Rieve, Gen. Pres. Textile Workers Union, C. I. O.,

"We do not and should not claim that God is on our side in every dispute. The labor movement is a form of applied Christianity. We seek to bring into industry the ethical relationships espoused by all religious faiths. By bringing economic freedom into the workers' daily lives, we promote their spiritual enrichment as well."

James B. Carey, Pres. International Union Electrical Workers, C. I. O., "Divine law and natural law hold that man has a God-given right to a job, the equal right to decide what the job shall be and the conditions under which he shall do it. These identical views of man's destiny make it imperative that Religion and Labor work together in harmony."

J. A. Beirne, Pres. Communications Workers, C. I. O.,

"Our churches teach us the way to spiritual happiness in this world and for eternity. Our free trade unions complement this teaching by day to day acts of moral righteousness, by passionately believing man is a creature composed of body and soul and made in the image of God, that every worker is to be treated with the dignity deserved by God's image. Religion and labor are partners in a very real sense."

Walter R. Reuther, Pres. U.A.W. A. F. L. C. I. O.,

"In the United States, as our nation began to emerge as the greatest industrial power in the world, the voices of many spiritual leaders were raised in support of workers in their quest for social justice. The governing bodies of the churches began to take their stand in the cause of justice. Churches of all faiths, because of their concern for the welfare of working people, recognized the right to organize and bargain collectively."

To prove Mr. Reuther's statement we now list a few of the official pronouncements of church bodies.

National Council of Churches of Christ in America,

"We believe that Christianity provides sound and sure principles as guides to action; it gives a sense of direction and creates a will to work together.—Fair settlements arrived at through free and honest bargaining will open the way to a better economic and social life for all people. This freedom of workers has been endorsed and the important social contribution of the labor movement recognized by almost every branch of the Christian Church."

Gen. Conference of the Methodist Church, "We stand for the right of employers and employees alike to organize for collective bargaining and social action; protection of both in the exercise of their right; the obligation of both to work for the public good."

Southern Baptist Convention,

"We recognize the right of labor to organize and to engage in collective bargaining to the end that labor may have a fair and living wage."

Gen. Assembly United Presbyterian

"We urge the Church to stand firmly for justice for all persons, and the practice of Christian standards and ideals in all industrial relations. Labor unions have among their leaders, workers and members, a fair cross-section of Christian people."

Church of the Brethren,

"Laborers are always to be regarded as persons, and never as a commodity. Industry was made for man and not man for industry."

Board for Christian Social Action, Am. Luth. Church,

"The Church recognizes the right of human beings to own property. But property rights cannot be absolute. Ownership of property does not give the right to exploit human beings for monetary gain. The Church recognizes the right of labor to organize for collective bargaining and mutual protection but it also holds that any attempt of unionized labor to take undue advantage of employers and to exploit the general public is just as reprehensible as similar attitudes on the part of the employer. The ideal relation between employer and employee should be that of business partners."

What is the attitude of industry towards the church's concern in this area? That, too, has changed. In the beginning of our domestic industrial revolution, the average factory owner preferred to have the church remain aloof from the problems that he was encountering. The general feeling was that the church ought to be the defender of the "status quo". Motivated by Christian principles and living in a new era, when the rights of the human being are the issue of the day, big industry today is mindful of the obligation of the church to protect all human rights. It anticipates that the church's prophetic voice will be heard to protest vigorously when the laborer is not accorded proper treatment, when he is subjected to working conditions that undermine his health, when he is not adequately protected in his attempts to secure a livelihood for himself and his family. Industry knows that the church has a great deal of influence in shaping the attitudes of the general public and therefore is cautious in examining its dealings with labor, knowing that these acts will be scrutinized by an awakened Christian community. The industrialist also realizes that a scripturally based religion will defend his right of private ownership and his realizing a fair profit from his investment and the risking of his capital. Industry is aware that the church will not endorse any totalitarian movement that would seek the socialization of the major means of production. The National Association of Manufacturers and similar agencies of business men have established their own departments of church and industry relations so that they may maintain definite contacts with the church for purposes of interpretation. In many cities Employers' Groups have regular meetings, to which clergymen of all faiths are welcomed. At these meetings, open forums are held to discuss trends in industry.

Both management and labor perceive in the church's program a definite aid in assisting the laborer to overcome the monotonous drudgery of the modern assembly line, for in that program there are social and cultural outlets that no other organization can provide on the same scale. They are also aware that the problem of leisure time, increased by shorter working hours, is a fact with which the church most assuredly can and should assist in finding an adequate solution.

In order to chart most clearly the cooperation between the church and the labor organizations in America it is necessary to mention a few of the organizations that operate in this area.

The National Religion and Labor Foundation forms a bridge between organized religion, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, and organized labor. It is primarily an educational group seeking to strengthen activity by labor toward morally sound goals and to spur religion toward practical social achievement. It has been successful in maintaining a substantial support from labor groups and has representative labor and church leaders on its national board. Striving to create local chapters in larger industrial centers, it carries on seminars and group meetings in educational institutions throughout America.

The Catholic program in the industrial field is generally an educational program

carried on by Catholic Labor Schools. It is clear that the Catholic Church has made a thorough study of the industrial scene. Hundreds of priests have been trained as labor specialists and have been most successful in proving, not only to their own membership, but to the entire public the concern of their church. They are spurred on no doubt by the Pope's Encyclical of 1937 in which he includes this phrase, "Let our parish priests, therefore, dedicate the better part of their endeavors and their zeal to the winning back of the laboring masses to Christ and His church."

The Presbyterian Church deserves special credit for being among the first Protestants to establish industrial relations courses for ministers and theological students. The most prominent man among them in this field is Dean Marshall Scott, who in connection with McCormack Divinity School in Chicago, Illinois, runs a year-around program with field trips in addition to academic studies.

The Methodist Church is also experimenting in various ways. Their most noteworthy venture is that headed by the Rev. Emerson Smith throughout the New England States. He attempts to promote understanding between the various groups in industrial life. Since he is supported by his church and not bylabor or management, his friendly counsel and sympathetic treatment of factional disputes has earned for him the confidence that he enjoys from both factions. He is tireless in interpreting to the Methodist churches in his area the true basis for industrial peace.

The American Lutheran Church last year established the office of Director of Church-Industry Relations whose main assignment is to establish rapport with the industrial community and with the labor unions. Future plans include the conducting of seminars for ministers and labor leaders throughout the country. At present an experimental program is being carried on in the Detroit, Michigan and Toledo, Ohio areas, trying out techniques that may be employed elsewhere.

In the United Lutheran Church, the Rev. Harold Letts of its Social Missions Department has been most instrumental inmaking his church aware of the problems to be faced. He has written a booklet "The Church and Economic Life" which merits study.

On a national scale, no other organization has been as effective in bringing the impact of organized religion to bear upon labor-management problems, as has been the Department of Church and Economic Life of the National Council of the Churches of Christ. Under the stalwart leadership of the Rev. Cameron Hall, this agency has arranged innumerable conferences and consultations between leaders of industry, labor and the church. Though mildly censured by some men in industry as leaning too far in favor of labor, it is difficult to detect such a trend in its policies.

In general, we do not believe that what Andre Philip states in *Christianity and Crisis* is true of organized religion in America. He states "that most churches seem to believe in the Immaculate Conception of Labor, the virgin which alone is spotless of social sin. This belief seems to stem from a guilt complex aroused because the church has left labor to its own devices too long."

The good influence of all the above movements is best summarized in a recent syndicated article entitled "Religion Today". There we read, "The steadying hand of the church today lends many a soothing touch to the sore spots of labor-management relations. It is becoming a major religious specialty. The temper of the times is continuing to promise even greater achievement in religion-labor cooperation in the future. .. It's a two way street, with clergymen learning the problems and complexities of industrial relations, and in turn, offering religious approaches toward finding solutions."

This article would be most incomplete if it did not add an evaluation of the industrial chaplaincy movement which is being tried out in several plants in the north and in numerous factories throughout the south. Most of them are being sponsored by the industry itself and are in the main, conscientious attempts to bring spiritual help to the men employed in the factories through personal counseling and the like. We can find no better way of giving our personal analysis of the program than by quoting the summarizing paragraph which appeared in the Christian Century Sepember 1955.

"Here is the danger in a company-paid chaplaincy—that the chaplain may become a company-paid errand boy for bolstering company policy, pacifying complaints, playing on religious predilections to keep non-union workers happy. The church should not condone such prostitution of its ministry."

There are many other objections to the industrial chaplaincy. Such a ministry, through which the worker might find his own worship needs met, would still leave his family unchurched and would thus prove to be divisive. Because of the wide spread of denominations represented in a factory, it would be most difficult to bridge denominational differences in seeking a pastor who could minister to all faiths. This does not mean that the unchurched in the factories are not the object of our deep concern. But we do feel that the gospel ministration should center in and issue forth from the local churches. The man in the shop should not be regarded as a special object for a special missionary enterprise, any more than in any other walk of life. His spiritual needs are the same as those of any other unconverted man. The working man today is not necessarily living in a crowded industrial region. He is for the most part living in a respectable neighborhood, into which his increased earnings have permitted him to move. There he can best be contacted, not during working hours, by the pastor who shepherds that locality.

The best solution to ministering to the industrially employed and to prove our concern is for pastors to become acquainted with the problems of labor as well as those of management, and to prove that acquaint-anceship by making their sermons relevant to those problems.

That spiritual problems which require the specialized care of a clergyman do arise within a factory, we do not deny. Many of these are beyond the understanding of peronnel managers who have but a secular training to guide them in finding a solution. For such cases, we suggest that interdenominationally, the ministers of a community have their names placed on a referral list, making known their availability for any pastoral service they can render.

As far as winning the unchurched laborer, it is our contention that the church can find him better where he lives than where he works and treat him and his family as part of our normal field of evangelization. We have sufficient evidence to prove that the

average laborer resents being singled out as a member of special problem group requiring special treatment by the church.

The need for Christian service by the church in the context of our industrial society is then already being filled to a certain extent. The fact that the church is aware of the need of proving a deep earnest concern in this highly inflammable area of labor and management difficulties, combined with the established fact that this concern has helped in the past and promises to bear even more fruit in the future, is a most encouraging sign in industrial America today.

Theo J. Pretzlaff

## Czechoslovakia

# The Lutheran Confessions in Translation

The Lutheran church in Slovakia, which is now a minority church, has had a history subject to many changes. More than once in the more than four hundred years of her existence she has been persecuted, openly or under cover of legal measures, and frequently with bloodshed. Already at the time of the Reformation her first confessors, pastor Philip Nikolai and the teacher Gregory suffered martyrdom in Lubietová. The Counter-Reformation brought another great wave of persecution which lasted over a hundred years. Twice during this time, in 1673 and 1674, at the instigation of the Habsburg rulers and the leading clergy, a so-called "judicium delegatum" or special trial was held, which condemned over five hundred Evangelical pastors and teachers in Bratislava to loss of their office, exile and prison, although the accusers could prove no offense against the laws of the province. Ninety of the most resolute of them were driven in chains on foot over the Alps to Naples, where they were sold as galley slaves. Some years later confessing laymen also were brought to trial, and 24 of them were executed in Prešov. At this period 800 churches were lost to our Evangelical forbears. Services and ministerial acts were allowed to take place in only a few village churches prescribed by special decree. In

spite of this long period of suffering the Lutheran church in Slovakia is today a living church

How has she thus been able to preserve herself? It is definitely due to the action and will of her Lord. The Lord of the church has many ways of protecting and preserving his people. In this article I should like to refer particularly to one of these ways, namely the Lutheran Confessions. Then as now and certainly throughout the future, there can be a real confession of faith only where clarity and certainty prevail. "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." (II Tim. 1:12). This is the way the Apostle put it. But God gives us certainty in unity with the confession of our fathers.

When we speak of the confession of our fathers, we mean in the first place the Augsburg Confession and the Small Catechism. Already at the time of the Reformation two translations of these confessional writings appeared in the language of the country and were published in book form. It is interesting to note that these first translations came from Bohemia.

The first edition of the Augsburg Confession appeared in 1562 with the title Augšpurská konfessí aneb vyznání víry. This translation was later revised six times, in 1575, 1576, 1579 and, with Dresden as the place of publication, in 1608, 1609 and 1610. In 1620 the Confessio bohemica vere Augustana appeared in Prague. This was twice republished by Samuel Martinius, in 1630 and 1635. The editions mentioned were destined in the first place for the Czech Evangelicals. The basic translation in Slovak was J. Tranovský's Konfessí Augšpurská, budto vyznání víry, which appeared in 1620 in Olomouc. This highly gifted man, who came from Silesia, worked later as an exile in Slovakia.1 The text of his translation formed the basis for later works, notably those of V. Kleych (1720) and B. Tablic (1808 and 1837). The later translations, those of D. Langsfeld, Summa Augšpurského vyznání of 1831 and Karl Martinek, Augšpurské vyznání of 1856, in accordance with the spirit and taste of the time did not contain the whole of the Confessio

Augustana but only extracts from it. Langsfeld for example omits all "polemical parts" with the argument that "such parts would have only very little or no meaning for the people". It is true that both these translations were in fact intended for the people and not for the theologians. On the other hand, however, there was even at this period a series of complete translations. Among these we may mention that of D. B. Molnár, Prague: 1857, and B. Baltík, Budapest: 1880. The latter also published his translation again in 1803 and in a third edition in 1010. In 1930, for the Jubilee edition to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the Augsburg Confession, J. Drobný made use of Baltík's translation.

After the second world war the Augsburg Confession appeared in a new translation, in a volume containing three other confessional writings, entitled Čtyri vyznání-Four Confessions-Confessio Augustana, Confessio Fratrum, Confessio Helvetica and Confessio Bohemica. This edition was prepared by the Czech Evangelical Faculty in Prague. All the editions of the Augsburg Confession mentioned so far are translations into the Czech language, with the exception of that of Molnár and that of the faculty, which are in the so-called "Kralictina" or "Biblictina". This is the language of the Bible translation made at Kralice in Moravia, which dates from the years 1579-1593, and which has remained until the present day the liturgical language of the Slovaks. The books of worship, that is, the Bible, hymnal and order of service are also written in this language; there is also, it is true, a modern Slovak edition of the New Testament and the Psalms, and likewise of the hymnal and order of service, although the latter have been in existence only since last year.

The first translation of the Augsburg Confession into present-day Slovak was made in 1930 by J. Jahoda, whose work, however, was unfortunately never printed. Thus we are confronted by the remarkable fact that our basic book of doctrine was incomparably more widespread in the early years of the Reformation than in later times, not to mention the present.

What were the motives which played a part in the individual translations and the editions of the Augsburg Confession in the vernacular? According to the material which is here before us they must have been very diverse motives. The edition at the time of

He also produced the hymnal Cithara Sanctorum or Pisne duchorni, which is still used today, and which ranks in the Slovak congregations almost as a confessional writing.

the Reformation was intended to introduce the people to the Evangelical doctrine and strengthen them in it. Later at the time of the Enlightenment the Confessions became an interesting piece of literature. Though here too the instruction of the people played a considerable role, it was determined by an interest different from that of the Reformation. This interest is characterized by what Tablic wrote in the foreword to his edition: "Finally I pray God that this book too may serve to spread abroad pure knowledge in the matter of religion and to encourage our literature." This educational aim was also followed by the outline of church history appended to the book. In 1870 Baltik expressed the hope that people would regard his work "as a purely private literary undertaking", although he was thoroughly aware of the need for a translation, officially accepted by the church, of all the Confessions.

It is primarily the Latin text of the Augsburg Confession which is the basis of the translations mentioned. Many also at the same time took the German text into account or used it as a parallel to the Latin text. This is the case, as far as I can see, particularly in the edition of the Czech faculty, which actually represents something of a compilation of the two texts. It is clear that this cannot be the way of a church which is true to its confession, but grows out of views alien to those of Lutherans regarding the nature and the role of a confession.

The picture is different when we turn to the Small Catechism. Here there is a whole host of editions. Apart from the "Enlightening Catechisms", which were published almost as frequently, the Small Catechism has appeared about eighty times. It was likewise translated into Czech "Kralictina" and in contrast to the other Confessions was "Slovakized" only in the years after the first world war.

Of the many editions we shall mention only a few which are especially interesting, among them particularly the oldest ones. According to information given by the hymnologist and historian of literature, Dr. J. Durovic, who died recently, the first Small Catechism in the Czech language appeared in 1530, in Boleslava in Bohemia. A translation was published in 1581 in Bardejov, Slovakia. Some years later, in 1612, a second translation appeared. It is

not known who made the first translation, and the second is the combined work of the first three superintendents, E. Lani, S. Melik and J. Abrahamides. This last edition is still in use today. It is considered to be the "classic edition" and has become *de facto* a "textus receptus". It is based on the German text, but also takes account here and there of the Latin one.

Present-day bibliographical scholarship recognizes in these two catechisms the first and the third printings in so-called "Biblictina" in Slovakia.<sup>2</sup>

To many handwritten orders of service, of which we in particular have a very large number, have been appended original handwritten translations of the catechism. Of the catechisms which have been printed, we should like to mention two in particular; firstly "Evanj. obrazkový katechizmus" which our great defender of Lutheran orthodoxy, J. M. Hurban, published, with woodcuts by Küchle, but which did not find very wide circulation among the people. At the end of the development stands Bishop A. L. Katina with a translation of the Small Catechism into Slovak.

Until the end of the last century our church did not possess either in Czech or in Slovak a translation of the Book of Concord. Such a translation appeared only two years before the turn of the century in the form of the "Kniha svornosti", a translation by J. Leška which was published both in Békes Csaba, Hungary, and in the United States.

Leška incorporated into his work, with some corrections, the translation of the Augsburg Confession by Baltik and that of the catechism by the three superintendents. He translated the other symbolical books himself from the Latin. Thus for the first time our church had all the Confessions in her mother tongue. Nevertheless this basic classic was never declared the official authentic translation. This was connected with the circumstances of the time, under which the Slovak Lutheran church was part of the Lutheran church of Hungary, which had Hungarian as its official language. Strange to say, however, even after the attainment of independence by the Slovak Lutheran church in the Czechoslovak Republic, no such official reception of this

<sup>2.</sup> Dr. B. Bálent, Bardejovské Katechizmy z rokov 1581 a 1612. Turc. Sv. Martin. Foreword p. 21.

translation has taken place even to the present day. There is a peculiar set of problems connected with this fact, problems which concern ordination. The church laws of the Synod of Zilina-Sillein, dating from 1610, stipulated that the ordinand, in order to be admitted to ordination, had to sign the Book of Concord. The ordination vow is also expressly attached to the Augsburg Confession and the Formula of Concord. This principle remains in force to the present day. Our order of service which appeared last year binds the ordinands in their ordination vow to the symbolical books of the church of the Augsburg Confession. Now Leška's Kniha svornosti is out of print and very hard to obtain. Apart from this there are editions of the symbolical books in German and Latin, but the linguistic aptitude of theological students today is certainly not sufficient to read the Confessions in the original languages. And so they take their ordination vow without any real knowledge of the obligations they thus take on. Among many other reasons this was the principal one which made a new translation of the symbolical books a matter of urgent necessity. I should like to pass on some of the experiences which I myself have collected in the course of this work, as editor and translator.

In the first place the question had to be clarified as to which text, the German or the Latin, was to be selected as the basis for translation. It was clear from the beginning that one could not possibly rely on both texts simultaneously. J. Leška, the first translator of the Book of Concord mentioned above, used the Latin text even where the confession in question was originally written in German. This method does not seem to be appropriate, since one is making a translation of a translation. So it was decided to base each translation on the original text, that ist, to translate the Apology and the Tractatus de potestate pape from the Latin, and the other confessional writings from the German. In the case of the Augsburg Confession the German text was decided upon, because it was read at the Imperial Diet of Augsburg in German. For the translation the edition of the Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchenausschuß, Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche The Confessional Writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church], Göttingen: 1930<sup>3</sup> was used.

The translation itself raised new difficulties. It was a case of avoiding both the Scylla of literal and the Charybdis of free translation. The former would have endangered its being readily understood, the latter its binding character. So it was necessary to strike a golden mean and at the same time to take into account the work of earlier translators. They were concerned always to make an intelligible and fitting translation. Baltik said in the foreword to his edition of the Augsburg Confession that he had "here and there departed from the strict form of expression in order to make what was said intelligible to the Slovak people". And Leška wrote, "I do not see in translation a school exercise in which one must take account of every grammatical nuance, but a transmission of the true doctrine from a foreign language into our mother tongue". Both men in any case possessed the art of meeting in a masterly way this task which they had set themselves without sacrificing anything at all of the substance. This was the aim which we too had set for ourselves. In how far we have succeeded the future will have to show.

There is still another question connected with what has just been said, namely that of the formation of our own theological terminology. Our young theological scholarship has not as yet worked out its own specialized vocabulary. Our Catholic brethren are in this respect a good step further along, but their terms are too much bound to Latin scholasticism, which they take over more or less literally. This is in contradiction to the spirit of our language as well as to the principles of the Reformation. Therefore we chose another path. We have collected the expressions and turns of phrase of "Biblictina" which has been used up to the present and have given two philologists the task of finding the Slovak equivalents of these expressions and turns of phrase. This work was carried on simultaneously with that of translation and has also continued since.

The method used in the translation was as follows. First one man was given the task of the whole translation. Then two others were commissioned to compare the translation with the original text and to furnish it with notes and suggestions for changes. Afterwards the entire work was

<sup>3.</sup> New edition, Göttingen: 1952, Verlag Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht.

laid before Bishop emeritus V. B. Čobrda, who is a very competent linguist, with the request that he should compare it once more with the original text and correct it. This work was then read critically once again by the other two. Thus quite spontaneously there grew a circle of those working here, who have taken over the responsibility for the work, a responsibility which they bear to the whole church.

Meanwhile the request has been made to the General Convention of our church that an advisory committee should be appointed to whom should be assigned the authority to approve officially for the church not only the new edition of the Confessions but also all the other authoritative works on worship and doctrine. There is also appended to the translation a literary and historical introduction and a detailed index, so that the edition is now complete. Only one great difficulty now remains. There is not enough money to enable this large book to be published. But we hope that with God's help it will be possible to overcome even this last great obstacle.

Otto Vizner

## France

## The Present Theological Situation

To describe in a single sentence the theological situation in France one might say: it is characterized above all by the continuation of forces already at work and by a very slowly progressing transformation.

The influence of Karl Barth on French Protestantism continues to be considerable. Lutheran Alsace, apart from isolated exceptions, has from the beginning been closed to dialectical theology, it is true, and has essentially remained so. That is explained no doubt by the continued and still strong influence of the tendencies of the 19th century, that is, of a synthesis of liberalism and pietism on the one hand, and confessionally conscious Lutheranism which emerged around 1850 on the other. But since the second world war Barth has been without doubt a significant power not only in the whole of French Protestantism, but beyond this also in the public consciousness of France. The publication of the trans-

lation of Barth's Dogmatics, begun by the publishing house Labor et Fides in Geneva, is making good progress. Recently the public defence of a doctor's dissertation by a Catholic theologian on the theology of Karl Barth caused a great stir. In addition the Reformed dogmatician at the Paris Evangelical Lutheran faculty, Jean Bose, has professed Barthian theology in his work for his licentiate. The Community of Taizé has done likewise, as has been shown especially by Max Thurian's latest book on celibacy. It teaches a kind of christological foundation, not indeed of marriage in general, which is left to nature, but of Christian marriage; more precisely, not merely of Christian marriage insofar as it is Christian. but insofar as it is marriage. Within internal French Lutheranism it is not so much the Lutheran church of Paris as that of Montbéliard which indicates openness to the influence of Barthian theology. While in Paris at the present time the prevailing tendency is towards the emphasis of the Confessions. in Montbéliard there exists a certain reversion from confessional thinking.

In regard to Strasbourg and Alsace, one may speak here of a crisis in the tendencies which have hitherto prevailed. It cannot be said that the minority who are consciously confessional have completely exhausted their strength, but it must be admitted that there is a pronounced weakening. Many pastors of the younger generation have turned to the Berneuchener movement in the Brotherhood of St. Michael, which represents a kind of Lutheranism which is in its way valuable, though strangely novel. But the Strasbourg theological faculty too, which since the radical intellectual change which followed the Revolution has been the stronghold of Alsation rationalism and liberalism, obviously finds itself today in an intellectual-theological crisis. It still has the strength to take over a great historical task, the publication of the Latin part of Bucer's works. Certain expectations are hereby connected in the area of systematics. For example Prof. Henri Strohl, Dean Emeritus of the Theological faculty at Strasbourg, expresses more and more frequently the opinion that Bucer was the mediator between Luther and Calvin, the man who preserved the heritage of Luther much more genuinely and faithfully than for example Melanchthon did. Much discussion has been evoked by the novel of

the one-time student pastor in Strasbourg, Henri Hatzfeld, entitled Feuer und Wind, which presented the idea that the form of the Protestant ministry which has existed up to the present is now found wanting and that other forms must be sought. In addition the voice of Bultmann is heard now and then. In particular a Catholic theologian has published an analysis of theological demythologization from a historical and systematic point of view, as thoroughly executed as perhaps only Catholic theology is able to do in France today. We are reminded of the frequently observed phenomenon in the history of modern theology, the fact that the great themes of theological discussion in Germany and other countries are taken up about 15 years later in France, where they are presented in an elegant form and passionately discussed. This was what happened with the problem of the historicity of Jesus, with the dialectical theology of Karl Barth, and in the same way we may assume that Bultmann's program will increasingly draw to itself French attention in the years that lie ahead.

This all shows that the vigor of liberal theology in France today is by no means broken. Accordingly it seems to me that one may justly speak of a crisis of this tendency and particularly of the old Strasbourg school. It is given expression for example in the fact that the old pastors and their organizations are being forsaken by the younger generation of pastors. I should like also to recall the phrase used recently by the Strasbourg Dean Charles Hauter: today one must await the emergence of new theologians who would make allowance for the crisis of Hellenism in Western thinking. This formula is certainly rather obscure, but at least it expresses very clearly the feeling that theology is at a critical stage.

In the inter-confessional situation in France a book by a convert has attracted public attention: Du Protestantisme à l'Eglise (From Protestantism to the Church), by R. P. Bouyer, Professor in the Catholic theological faculty in Paris, and a former vicar of the Evangelical Lutheran church in Paris. The author would like to move his Protestant former co-religionists to take the same path he has taken from Protestantism to the church, that is to the Roman church. The first half of the book presents a very good introduction to the basic ideas

of the Reformation, which was greeted by many Protestant reviewers almost as an evangelical catechism, and which could help many Catholics to a better understanding of the Reformation and of Protestantism. But then the second half attempts to show how these basic ideas, deriving from medieval nominalism, have in the Reformation and the four centuries of Protestant history become corrupted to such a degree and perverted into the opposite of what they were that their import can be preserved and brought to development only by union with the Roman church. This publication was followed by a discussion on the relationship of Luther to nominalism. In any case this discussion reveals clearly how interest in the figure of Luther and in the significance of his work has been awakened in France since the second world war. And so the time has seemed ripe to bring out a large edition of Luther's works in a French translation. The initiative for this, it is true, came not from the Lutheran church, but from a publishing house, Labor et Fides in Geneva, which is of the opinion that a translation of Luther could encounter the same interest today as a translation of Karl Barth's Dogmatics.

Fundamental questions are also being posed afresh in connection with the work of liturgical commissions on both the Lutheran and the Reformed side, as for example the questions of baptism, confirmation and ordination. The contrast with the Reformed position, according to which infant baptism is no longer obligatory, has strengthened the ecclesiastical and confessional consciousness of the Lutherans, especially in Paris. In Strasbourg, in connection with a Kirchentag for eastern France, which took place in October of this year, questions of the Christian influence on public life were treated. Problems of hymnology arouse lively interest; they have also become directly significant for the church through the publication of a new German hymnal for Alsace and Lorraine, in which the Alsatian Berneuchener have successfully collaborated, and through the work on a revision of the French hymn book Louanges et Prières.

This report could end here, but much that is essential would then not have been expressed. It is not enough to deal with important individual problems of church and theological life. It is not the Christian faith

as such, but the indispensably necessary theological interpretation of this faith in the church, which is called in question today, and therefore it is not a matter of individual problems, but of the task of building up a new Evangelical and Lutheran theology as a whole. In this connection the philosophy of Edmund Husserl seems to be acquiring in theological thought in France and especially in Alsace an importance which cannot yet be assessed. This philosophy was communicated to us by Husserl's pupil Jean Hering, who until recently was lecturing in New Testament theology at Strasbourg. Certainly there has been no formation of a phenomenological school in theology, since the outcome of this effort is by no means the same in every case, but it seems that starting from this point one of the most difficult problems of presentday theological thinking can be attacked, the problem of a scientific attitude and objectivity.

Husserl replaces Kant's Critique of Reason by another critique which does not shrink from scholarly objectivity, but strives to understand its true nature, its necessary bases and thus its range, its limits, its particular and circumscribed area. In doing this he enables theology to make a fresh approach, since after all theology necessarily uses the intellectual equipment which it borrows from the history of human culture to approach questions whose ultimate answer lies outside the history of culture.

Perhaps this and much that I have said previously seems to be too avant-garde in character: But all of us in all countries should know that it is high time to abandon impassable ways and take the first steps upon those paths of which only God knows where they will one day lead.

Theobald Suss

# Germany

# Sunday School Work of the Churches in Exile

Shortly after World War II, Lutheran refugee groups from Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland started to organize congregations and churches-in-exile in Western Germany.

Needless to say, these churches had highly qualified and consecrated pastors and church workers, but practically none of them had been adequately trained for the new and different kind of responsibility which they faced in their newly organized congregations. But it has been a wonderful experience to see how they managed to carry on a spiritual ministry to their people in spite of the numerous problems and difficulties.

More than ten years have passed since that time now and these congregations in Germany are still active, the pastors and lay-workers of the churches-in-exile are still able to serve their brethren, many of whom are old and sick. Through God's help these people have been able to hear his Word in their mother tongue, even though far away from their native countries.

Since the very beginning, these exile churches have paid special attention to the question of youth and Sunday School work. They saw immediately that because of a lack of pastors, it would be necessary to mobilize a number of qualified lay-workers to conduct Sunday Schools and to give religious instruction to children in the refugee camp schools. With the assistance of the Lutheran World Federation's Service to Refugees funds, two highly qualified pastors were engaged to organize the Sunday School program and to conduct special courses and conferences for Sunday School teachers at the LWF/SR study centers in Insula (Berchtesgaden) and Imbshausen. Religious literature, hymn books, Bible text explanations, religious picture post cards and slide projectors with appropriate films were provided and circulated among the various exile Sunday Schools.

Because emigration caused more and more vacancies in the ranks of Sunday School teachers, a constant training of new teachers at the LWF/SR study centers was very important. In the summer of 1951, however, this work came to an end because both the Insula and Imbshausen study centers were discontinued and the two pastors in charge of the program had emigrated. The general situation of the remaining congregations and their members became more complicated because they were far more scattered and the number of pastors was comparatively much smaller then before. New Sunday School teachers were found who were willing to continue the program of the workers who had emigrated, but many of them had had no special training.

In spite of the fact that some children had started to attend German schools it was felt that there was still a need for Sunday School work in the exile congregations, especially since many of the families were living in camps located far away from German settlements. Besides this, families were still praying in their mother tongue at home and it was naturally their wish that the children receive religious instruction in the same language. The providing of religious literature, Bible text explanations and other material had been discontinued and the remaining pastors had not sufficient time to organize a program for Sunday Schools.

This was the situation when early in 1954 an initiating group from the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian churches-in-exile as well as staff members of LWF/World Service came together to discuss these problems and to try to find solutions which could at least partly meet the needs. During this conference it was decided that a Sunday School teachers' training course should be organized. Qualified pastors from the churches-in-exile, as well as from the German Lutheran churches, were invited to give lectures.

Invitations were sent to 25 teachers and they were asked to attend the first training course in Camp Augustdorf during the Easter holidays of 1954. The ladies' committees of the Estonian and Latvian congregations at Augustdorf were mobilized to help carry out this project. Those organizing the course were satisfied when nearly all of the invited Sunday School teachers arrived. The group met for three days to listen to wellprepared lectures about Sunday School work and its methods and to discuss their own problems. Efforts were made to find new ways of vitalizing the work and it was discovered that one of the main problems was the lack of suitable literature. A special commission was appointed to study this problem and to make suggestions. A financial contribution was made available by LWF/WS to provide the most essential books, films and other equipment. At the end of these three busy days, everyone felt that the course had not been in vain and that new insights were gained. The initiators were asked to consider the question of organizing another course during the coming months. The second course was held again in Augustdorf in January 1955 (for northern Germany) and the third one in Munich in April 1955 (for southern Germany).

The fourth course was held in Augustdorf from April 5-7, 1956. This time 45 Sunday School teachers of the Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Polish Lutheran churches-in-exile from northern as well as from southern Germany took part in this conference. This was probably the first conference of this kind for lay-workers of churches-in-exile in Germany. It was quite interesting to notice that these laymen from the different churches have become during the past two years a team of workers trying to find answers to their common problems. It was also quite apparent that they have become more confident and that several of the problems of the past have already been solved. One cannot say, however, that the situation as such has notably improved or that all problems are solved.

The opening service was held by the then Senior Representative of LWF/WS in Germany, Dr. Richard W. Solberg and the pastors A. Keleris (Lithuanian) and O. Puusepp (Estonian) at the Lutheran chapel in Augustdorf. Dr. Solberg gave the first lecture on "The Work in American Sunday Schools". This was not only an interesting report on American Sunday School work, but also gave some basic principles of the purpose of a Sunday School. The participants were especially grateful for the opportunity to learn about the work which is being done by their American brethren. Without doubt this lecture will help them to find new ways in their own work in camp and settlement congregations.

A lecture by the Latvian pastor E. Bahn-Bonnet about "The Bible and Dogma in Youth Work" pointed out special dogmatic problems in the work with children and youth. The German pastor Marquardt from Bethel gave a very fine and illustrative lesson about the use of methods in Sunday School work. All these three lectures were very carefully prepared to fit the needs of congregations in the diaspora. Besides these lectures, there were Bible studies every morning and discussion groups every afternoon.

These Sunday School teachers experienced the blessing of these three days and they returned home spiritually refreshed. For new vision of their responsibilities and new strength in Jesus Christ accompanied them.

Laimons Pavuls

## CORRESPONDENCE

#### The Church of South India

Sir: Dr. Vajta's article is based on knowledge of a number of documents from the vast literature on South India, and in particular of the Scheme of Union itself. And yet, as so often happens, one who lived through the actual events can only say, on reading such a documentary study, "It wasn't really in the least like that." I am one of the few survivors from the heroic age of the South India movement; I arrived in India in 1924, and served on the Joint Committee from 1934 till 1944. Bishop Hollis and Bishop Newbigin are comparative newcomers, though of course their evidence is more important than mine for the period subsequent to 1947.

The heart and center of Dr. Vaita's criticism is what he regards as the neglect of doctrinal study and doctrinal agreement in the course of the South India negotiations. I am quite prepared to admit that certain subjects might have been more carefully considered; that there was disregard of the significance of doctrinal agreement I categorically deny. In South India we worked on a certain principle, which must be clearly understood, and which from my own experiences in South India and from my knowledge of other union movements I will defend to my dying day. We drew a distinction between articles of union and a confession of faith. A confession of faith can only be an expression in articulated form of a common faith which has been lived and experienced by a church. All that can be done by churches which desire to unite is to draw up articles of union, and these cannot be more than a mutual explication of agreements in faith, with the limitation that this faith has not been experienced in common, and that, as we now know well, even those things which we believe ourselves to hold in common we hold in different ways, since our faith is a totality and every part of it is modified by every other part and by the whole. We were convinced, and I am still convinced that on many matters agreement could be reached only within the life of a united church, and that to attempt to reach agreement on these while still in separation could only lead to frustration. Perhaps not everyone will agree with this point of view; but, unless this principle is clearly understood, no intelligent judgment can be passed on what was done in South India.

This is not, however, to be understood as meaning that during the long years of negotiation theological questions were neglected. Dr. Vajta asks the question why the negotiations took so long, and why there is so little difference between the original scheme of 1020 and the final form of the Scheme. The answer is in the first place that twenty years is not too long to educate churches which desire to enter into union, if that union is to be more than an intellectual interest of a group of leaders. But the delay was also due to the extreme seriousness with which we took every criticism of the Scheme, from whatever quarter it might come, and to the patient attempts to find a theological answer to each question. An excellent example of this is the question of lay celebration of the Holy Communion, which was raised at a comparatively late stage of the discussions, and with which I had personally a great deal to do. This involved a careful re-consideration of the whole question of the priesthood of the church, and of the functions of the various orders within it. In the end we were not led to make any serious modifications in the Scheme: but no one who was on the sub-committee that dealt with the question will have any doubt as to the intellectual travail through which we passed before agreement was reached on this difficult and crucial problem.

It seems to me that Dr. Vajta gravely underestimates the measure of agreement that was reached among us. The reader will remember that we agreed on the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures, on a brief confession of faith making clear that Trinitarian interpretation of the Scriptures

which alone would be accepted in the united church, and on the Nicene Creed as the authorized summary of the faith. (The Athanasian Creed, being a purely western document, was not included among the symbolic documents of what should naturally be in the first place an eastern church). It seems to me that these agreements are of overwhelming importance. If we all really preached the whole of the Christian faith as set forth in the Nicene Creed, the list of differences which I would myself list as genuinely Kirchentrennend would be very short indeed. It is laid down in the Scheme that every individual is not to be committed to the acceptance of every word of the Creeds. I would myself have preferred that this sentence should not have been included; but anyone familiar with the history of heresy trials in the Lutheran churches in the last eighty years will understand at once why some of our friends desired an assurance that the Creeds were genuinely intended to be the joyful expression of a common faith, and not instruments, in the remarkable phrase of Queen Elizabeth, to make windows into men's souls.

Dr. Vajta points out that the question of baptism was not fully discussed. It must be remembered that in a growing church both baptism of believers and baptism of infants are practiced as normal parts of the church's life. The Baptists were not concerned in the negotiations; we had plenty to do without taking up what at the time were purely theoretical considerations; but this is not to say that there is no positive teaching on the nature of a sacrament and the significance of baptism. It is affirmed in the Basis of Union that "the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord are means of grace through which God works in us", and that "there is in the teaching of Christ the plain command that men should follow his appointed way of salvation by a definite act of reception into the family of God". The one crucial question about sacraments is whether they are acts of God or acts of men. On this all-important question the Church of South India bears clear and uncompromising witness.

It is true that the Church of South India has not put forth any elaborate definition of the nature of the presence of Christ in the Holy Communion. It has, however, affirmed that "in every Communion the true Celebrant is Christ alone, who continues in the Church today that which He began in the Upper Room. In the visible Church, the celebration of the Lord's Supper is an act of the Church, the company of believers redeemed by Christ, who act as the local manifestation of the whole Church of Christ in heaven and on earth." The more these words are pondered, the deeper their theological significance is seen to be. Could all the Lutheran churches subscribe to them? If so, I would feel that the differences between them and the Anglican churches in this field of theology are less than I have sometimes believed them to be.

We may apply the same principle of interpretation to the episcopate in the Church of South India. It is not difficult to find certain lacunae and inconsistencies in the statements of the Basis of Union and the Constitution on the subject. I do not think that this is surprising. The representatives of the non-episcopal churches, holding correctly that theology is the interpretation of experience, and that, not having had the episcopate, they could not formulate a theology of it before union, refused to be tied by any definite theological formulations. But they did all accept the historic episcopate as a good gift of God to his church. (It is, in my opinion, most unfortunate that the Bishops of the C.S.I., in a statement put forth in April of this year, referred to the historic episcopate "as the gift of one of the uniting Churches, offered as its contribution to the life of the United Church". That may be what they think now; it certainly was not the basis on which the C.S.I. came into being.) We declared that in our judgment the historic episcopate was "expedient" for the Church of South India. I remember pointing out at the time that this term might be interpreted in terms of "mere expediency", to which Bishop Waller of Madras replied by quoting, "It is expedient for you that I go away". I still think that those who are not familiar with classical English might be misled by this expression, and might fail to grasp the agreement on this fundamental question, which underlay the acceptance of the historic episcopate as part of the order of the C.S.I.

For after all this is the essential question that we have to ask the Lutheran churches.

Do they agree that the episcopate is a good gift of God to his church, or do they regard it as merely a human device for the better organization of the church? If the latter, I personally would not be the least interested in negotiations with them with a view to closer union. If the historic episcopate is of merely human origin, I am not in the least interested in it, and would be quite prepared to dispense with it! The more I see of other churches, and the more closely I observe their life, the more profoundly I become convinced that episcopacy is a gift from God, and that those churches which have it not are gravely impoverished by their lack of it. A united church should be richer than disunited churches; for this reason it is inconceivable that any Anglican church would enter into negotiations with any other church, unless that church was at least open to consider the possibility that God has shown us something of his will which perhaps has not been so clearly evident to others in the past.

The point to which I am leading up is that the most misleading part of Dr. Vajta's article is that in which he suggests that the Church of South India hardly deserves to be called a church, but might rather be regarded as a federation. From the practical point of view, the agreement reached as to the presentation of the Gospel of redemption in the C.S.I. is far closer than that which prevails in the Lutheran churches. Dr. Vajta knows much better than I that, if I take a trip in Germany, I shall hear from many Lutheran pulpits what is, from the biblical and Anglican point of view, desolating and devastating heresy, such as would not be tolerated for a moment in the C. S. I. It is not for me to judge doctrinal laxity in a church other than my own (we have plenty of trouble with doctrinal laxity in the Church of England); I am concerned to point out that we must face facts as facts, and must avoid the selfrighteous hypocrisy of pretending that things are other than they are.

It is at this point that I think we are in a position to understand the failure of the Lutherans to accept the invitation to participate in the negotiations, on which Dr. Vajta has quite correctly commented. It was the lack of unity among the Lutherans which was the difficult obstacle. We often speak of "Lutherans" as though they were a homogeneous body. But in fact we always have

to ask, "What Lutherans?" In South India my nearest neighbors were the Missouri Synod Lutherans, who would not even pray with other Lutherans. On the retirement of Bishop Bexell, the eminent German missionary Dr. Fröhlich had been elected Bishop of Tranquebar, but could not take office, because he was unwilling to be consecrated. holding that consecration was a meaningless ceremony - a view which of course the Church of Sweden and the Swedish mission could not accept. Personally I very much regretted the absence of the Lutherans on many grounds. But I cannot but think that in the circumstances their wisest policy was rather to seek a closer unity in their own divided ranks than to complicate the life of their churches by participation in negotiations with non-Lutheran church bodies. I am not sure whether the Lutheran situation in India has yet changed so much for the better as to make possible more than such rather informal conversations as have taken place between their representatives and those of the C.S.I.

In studying Dr. Vajta's article, and the quotation from Dr. Wingren which precedes it, I have found myself becoming increasingly anxious as to the attitude which I as an Anglican, committed to a biblical basis for the church and for theology, ought to take up towards my Lutheran brethren. I have tried to get this anxiety clear in my own mind, and I find that it can be resolved into three questions:

- 1. Are the Lutheran churches in any sense genuinely Trinitarian? Is their acceptance of the ancient formularies of the church more than a mere gesture towards formulae which no longer have any practical consequence in the life of the churches?
- 2. Have the Lutheran churches any biblical understanding of the nature of the ecclesia as set forth in the New Testament, or do they think only in terms of "the Lutheran churches" and "other churches"? (It is significant that Anglicans always speak of reunion and not of union; unless we in some sense have union, we could not seek it, and all that we can aim at is the manifestation of an already existing union, which is not manifest in our divisions.)
- 3. Have the Lutheran churches any biblical doctrine of the ministry, in terms of the divine giving as set forth in Ephesians 4:8—16?

I hope that a firmly affirmative answer can be given to all these questions. That is not for me to say. But, if it cannot, clearly for a church such as the Anglican to engage in discussions with the Lutherans with a view to church union would seem to imperil its biblical foundation, and to jeopardize the spiritual treasures of its past. Such are the anxieties which have been aroused in a not unsympathetic Anglican mind by a good many trends in recent Lutheran theological thought and writing.

Stephen Neill

### The Problem of Language

It is to Wilhelm Hahn's great credit that in his article [LUTHERAN WORLD, Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 141-150] he has strongly underlined the problems connected with the question of language and languages. Unfortunately one now and then hears the opinion expressed that a pastor could learn and adopt Portuguese, for example, with ease. Even when the pronunciation is tolerable and no objection can be raised to the grammar, it is almost always either the Portuguese version of the international newspaper language which can only rarely speak to the heart, or a language which speaks to the heart when the hearer translates it back into German for himself. The same thing is true when a man or a group undergoes a change of language. They adopt the corresponding version of the international language of the newspaper. Press telegrams are after all translated into all languages, and thus a soulless newspaper language has developed, in which the words are actually interchangeable. There is similarly, no doubt, an international scientific language. But that too, whatever the version - German, English, Spanish or Portuguese - is at bottom without a soul.

The language of a people is the expression of the soul of a people. That is why it is said that one has as many souls as the languages one knows. He who really learns the language of a people picks up along with it something of the soul of the people who formed the language or have spoken it for centuries. There is the danger either that it results only in a superficial and technical appropriation of the language or

that in becoming bilingual two souls are created which coexist unreconciled in the same person: (just as in many people the language of the church and the language of the street dwell side by side and unconnected, causing a dangerous schizophrenia in the soul). In either case the consequences are catastrophic.

For this reason the church dare not abandon those members of hers who are in such danger. When they go from one language world to another the church must help them so that this does not lead to the loss of their soul or to schizophrenia. Professor Hahn's demand that the church "make herself fully aware of the special conditions of such a transition and the possibilities and dangers inherent in it", that she serve her members particularly in these dangers, "decide on far-sighted strategy," and be prepared to enter upon entirely new paths, - all this is extremely significant and farreaching in implication especially for our church in Brazil. I should like to thank him sincerely for what he had to say and hope that his words may find a hearing.

What he wrote regarding South America is perhaps in part somewhat too generalized. Society, at least in regard to Brazil, is not so clearly formed by Catholicism alone. Positivistic and other influences have also had their part. And the different Protestant denominations have in part already contributed considerably towards unlocking the inner resources of the language as a vehicle for the Gospel.

One other point I should like to make. Even though God never spoke to men in a "super-language", the Gospel is always in danger of becoming falsified by means of the language in which it is preached. For the concepts of every language do not originally have meaning adequate to the Gospel for the simple reason that the souls of nations are never basically Christian. Only through repeated use on behalf of the Gospel does the meaning of words become Christian. To that extent one may perhaps dare to say that languages too must first be converted to the Gospel. With this reservation one can also say, however, that every more developed language has its special or peculiar possibilities of expressing the riches of the Gospel. For this reason the work of a church may never be merely "translation" in the usual sense of

the word. If I remember correctly, the demand was raised once before in LU-THERAN WORLD that the theology of a church too must not only be a translation or an importation. And rightly so! For theology is in fact also a representation of the formation of a soul of a people (which inds its expression in language) through the Gospel. Easily translatable theology is in danger of losing its soul just like the

language of the easily translatable press telegrams.

Many readers may well brand my statements as pre-war theology. I am conscious of the fact that my way of putting things falls somewhat outside the framework of the language current among today's theologians. But I have no intention of bowing to any kind of dictatorship of fashion, least of all in theology. Walter J. Schlupp

## **BOOK REVIEWS**

# The Foundation of Dogmatics

GRUNDLAGEN DER DOGMATIK [The Bases of Dogmatics], Vol. 1. By Otto Weber. Neukirchen/Moers: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1955. 708 pp.

THEOLOGIE ALS KIRCHLICHE WIS-SENSCHAFT. [Theology as the Church's Science]. Vol. II: Dogmatik. By Hermann Diem. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1955.

The present theological situation is characterized as a whole by a lively discussion of theological methods and principles. This discussion is particularly keen in the area of hermeneutics. In the first place of course it applies to exegetics. But the questions regarding the principles of theology have also become problematic once more for dogmatics, which having overcome liberal theology has either sought new ways to traverse or has returned to well-trodden paths. The fact that one work on dogmatics after another is appearing may seem strange in the light of this situation. This can be understood as a sign of robust health and as evidence that the assertion that there is a new crisis in theology represents an exaggeration. Doubtless there is an element of truth here. However, it must be emphasized that today there are a number of systematicians who refuse to see the tremendous difficulties which arise for the traditional discipline of dogmatics because of the influence of existential

In face of this situation the authors of the books mentioned above have reacted very differently.

Otto Weber, professor for Reformed theology at the University of Göttingen, has begun in the traditional continental style a broadly sketched presentation of dogmatics. (The first volume runs to 708 pages.) In form and content Weber is dependent on Karl Barth, to whose tremendous work on dogmatics he has already written a sort of compendium. Like Barth, Weber designates "the Word of God" — in three forms, as the Word which has taken place, the Word which is witnessed to, and the Word which is proclaimed — as the

decisive basis on which theology and its further development is to be built (cf. p. 195 ff.). The task of dogmatics consists in the "critical interpretation of dogma using its own criterion, that is, asking questions in regard to the Word of God, to which the Scriptures bear witness, bearing in mind the dogma of the church" (p. 54). Dogmatics is therefore "a function of the church". "The special task of dogmatics is to ask questions regarding the Word as that which has continuing validity, regarding the criterion for all preaching, teaching, and the historical fellowship of the church-and thus also regarding the criterion to which both exegesis and church history point, each in its own categories" (p. 65). After a section on the history of dogma (pp. 88-183), Weber proceeds to demonstrate the significance of this criterion and to show how it operates in the various loci of dogmatics: in the doctrine of revelation and of the Scriptures (under the heading "Gottes Selbsterschließung"-God's Self-Revelation-pp. 184-385), in the doctrine of God ("The Triune God", pp. 386-509), in the doctrine of creation (pp. 510-581) and in anthropology (pp. 582-695). The presentation as a whole reaches a decisive point in the doctrine of the "theopneustia" of Holy Scripture (p. 252 ff.). Here that question regarding criteria break off abruptly. "There is no general criterion by which the Word which is witnessed to might be read as the Word of God". "For this reason the Word of God can be recognized only through the Word of God" (p. 267). Here we find quite obviously that his thought proceeds in a circle, but Weber maintains that this is inevitable.

Weber's book contains detailed observations — it is supposed to be a textbook and as such doubtless has much that is positive to offer—and therefore also enters the present discussion on hermeneutics ("On the Problem of the Interpretation of Scripture"—p. 341 ff.). But this problem is taken very lightly, and on the whole Weber contents himself with playing off Barth against Bultmann.

Hermann Diem's reaction is essentially different, although he too has for a long time been sympathetic towards Karl Barth. Diem, who in spite of a series of significant theological publications has not been invested with a full professorship up to the present, judges the present discussion and the difficulties which have arisen because of it with extremely sharp words. He writes: "Must there be a continuance of the dismal condition of present theological discussion, in which one has to be a disciple of a master and his school, or an adherent of a certain theological tendency, at such a cost that one is no longer able to talk with the other man or to read his works, indeed, that one no longer needs to read them, and therefore in fact rarely does so?" (p. 243).

Diem hopes to find the key to the problem out of which the various opposing methodological standpoints have grown. He wants to indicate that point at which a fruitful discussion is still possible and indeed necessary, and declares therefore that the "mood of resignation" which is becoming ever more widespread among the leading theologians is unfounded. In the pursuit of this intention Diem has written a thoroughly learned book, which however is far from suitable for someone attempting to penetrate for the first time into the problems of theology (even though he has given to his book, Theologie als kirchliche Wissenschaft, the modest sub-title: Handreichung zur Einübung ihrer Probleme [An aid to familiarization with its problems). Only someone who has thoroughly studied such prominent theologians as Barth, Bultmann, Ebeling, Gogarten and their lieutenants possesses the necessary background for following the at times very subtle discussions carried on in Diem's new work. In the arrangement of his material he departs on more than one occasion from the pattern of traditional scholastic dogmatics. One of the most important paragraphs of his book seems to me to be the introductory paragraph on "Dogmatics called in question by historicism and existentialism" and likewise also paragraphs ten and eleven, which deal with "The task of systematic theology as a problem of the interpretation of Scripture" and "The interpretation of Scripture as the theological center of dogmatic thought". One can say that these two paragraphs represent Diem's own attempt at a solution.

In the introductory chapter Diem as a Kierkegaard scholar advances an interesting theory directed against Bultmann and his school. People have only gradually come to

understand, says Diem, that Kierkegaard by no means wanted to "dismiss objectively valid thought. Rather he strove with the utmost possible passion for objectivity in subjectivity, for the realization of the generally valid truth in the subjectivity of an existing individual" (p. 24). Bultmann on the other hand, he claims, has interpreted Kierkegaard largely from the standpoint Heidegger's existential philosophy, although Heidegger himself is fully aware of the contrast between himself and Kierkegaard. The whole of dogmatics, he says, stands in danger of being reduced to a dialectics of existence, something which would by no means be in line with Kierkegaard's intentions, but would run directly counter to them.

In his own attempt to mark out the way for dogmatics, Diem takes as his startingpoint the concept of "witness accounts", since the writings of the New Testament must be understood as such. This concept is intended to designate the communication of "facts" as well as the "truth" connected with this communication of facts, which is heard and is to be personally appropriated. This testimony, which is thus invested with a dual meaning, is not dependent, however, on "a criterion of truth which is at the disposal of the hearer" (p. 246). "Existential and dogmatic verification of the witness accounts comes about solely through "the obedience of faith" and "the συμμαρτυρᾶιν of the πνεδμα" applies for both (p. 248 ff.). Therefore Diem too believes that the hermeneutic circle of thought is ultimately inevitable. "We have entered a hermeneutic circle in which the witness accounts can be interpreted only through the very things to which they bear witness, of which we ourselves can know only through the witnesses themselves" (p. 255).

One might of course ask whether a solution of this kind is not identical with a type of fundamental irrationalism or at least dangerously near to it. It is perhaps to be recommended that the debate in hermeneutics and systematic theology going on at present on the Continent begin to come directly to terms with a philosophical basis quite different from that created by existentialist philosophy, for example by coming to terms with the analysis of propositions and concepts carried on by logical positivism.

Gunnar Hillerdal

# Pauline Theology

AUFERSTEHUNG UND ERWÄHLUNG. Die doppelte Ausrichtung der Paulinischen Verkündigung. [Resurrection and Election. The double aspect of Pauline preaching]. By Karl Stürmer. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 2nd. Series, Vol. 53. 200 pages. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1953.

DIE GNOSIS IN KORINTH. Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen. [Gnosticism in Corinth. A study on the Epistles to the Corinthians.] By Walter Schmithals, Forschung zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 66. 257 pages. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.

PAUL AND RABBINIC JUDAISM. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. By W. D. Davies. VIII, 392 pages, 2nd. edition. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1955.

LEBENDIGES OPFER. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Apostels Paulus. [Living Sacrifice (Rom. 12:1). A contribution to the theology of the Apostle Paul]. By Philipp Seidensticker, O. F. M. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen XX 1/3; XVI, 347 pages. Münster/Westphalia: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1954.

JAKOBUS UND PAULUS. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Kanons. [James and Paul. A contribution to the problem of the canon.] By Georg Eichholz. Theologische Existenz heute. New Series 39. 51 pages. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1953.

According to Stürmer Paul comes to terms in Romans with the (dynamic) "Jewish religion of the will", in I Corinthians with the (static) Greek "religion of being" (p. 22); the law is constitutive for the former, wisdom for the latter (p. 31; Paul, according to Stürmer, had to do with actual Gnosis only in Colossae, p. 50). In order to clarify the relationship of Pauline preaching to each of these religions Stürmer undertakes a comparison of the "fundamental theological statements" of each epistle (p. 70 f.); and in doing so the old question is at the same time ultimately taken up regarding the relationship of the "juridical" and the "mystical" in Paul (pp. 51-69). The seven chapters which take up the comparison each begin from a passage from Romans and I

Corinthians but then generously draw upon statements in the Pauline epistles in general and close in each case with a tabular comparison of the differences brought to light. Chapters 1-3 of the main part deal with "The Message"; "The Judgment"; "Grace". Chapter 7 takes up "Hope". Chapter 4 describes the "erroneous direction" of Paul's opponents in Romans and I Corinthians, Chapter 5 shows the Pauline "corrective" and Chapter 6 "the paradox of Christian reality" in the "antithesis between flesh and Spirit" in Romans, between this world and Christ in I Corinthians (p. 144). In Romans the argumentation appears to be "more oriented towards the Heilsgeschichte", in I Corinthians "more existential" (p. 76; correspondingly: basis in scripture-basis in experience, p. 88), the Adam-Christ typology is carried through in Romans ethically, in I Corinthians existentially (p. 107, cf. 88); speaking to the Roman Christians Paul emphasizes "the subjective reality of salvation", to the Corinthians "the objective basis of salvation in Christ" (p. 114); in Romans judgment appears as the coming into effect of the wrath of God, in I Corinthians as the "annihilation of being" of wisdom (p. 79 f.), sin in Romans as lack of obedience, in I Corinthians as error (p. 84); in Romans the fact of Christ is seen ethically and anthropologically as the overcoming of sin, in I Corinthians existentially and cosmologically as the overcoming of death (p. 156 f.).

Thus Stürmer is constantly concerned to show that Pauline theology takes up the peculiar character of the basic Jewish and Greek attitudes (described above) not only antithetically, but also in the form of theses growing out of Christian theology itself. But under the weight of the Pauline statements it is shown ever more decisively that Paul's thought is thoroughly dynamic, volitional, etc. From Rom. 1 it is "evident", according to Stürmer, that "Paul's conception of sin is the Jewish one of the Old Testament" (p. 84). For Paul revelation is "not the communication of a supernatural knowledge, but a divine intervening and acting" (p. 80, cf. p. 92 f.). "Grace is for Paul not being, but a power" (p. 92, cf. pp. 94, 101). "The yearning for righteousness" is incorporated by Paul in a positive way into his theology in contrast to the "striving after wisdom" (p. 82 f.). The fact that in I Corinthians Paul leaves unsaid much

that is clearly stated in Romans, and also says much else differently, has its cause certainly in part in the fact that he is taking into account a way of thinking which is in Romans Jewish in character, in Corinthians Greek. But it might also partially be connected with the fact that in I Corinthians Paul is dealing with very concrete questions of the congregation there, and on the other side can take as his starting-point his extensive preaching activity there. For example one cannot very well infer e silentio from I Corinthians that Paul had not disclosed in Corinth that for him sin was disobedience to the will of God. In spite of this it is to Stürmer's credit that he has called attention to the whole set of questions and has thrown new light upon them.

Even more important, however, seems to me the treatment of Pauline theology in general. In the foreground of this theology, according to Stürmer, is "the Christ-event" ("the question concerning the appropriation of salvation" becomes a matter of purely secondary importance for Paul beside this, p. 94; in contrast Stürmer emphasizes the "objective validity" of faith, p. 126), the Christ-event indeed seen both as a historical event of Cross and Resurrection ("in the death of Jesus we have died with him to the law and to sin", pp. 124, 133, etc.) and as something present and future (cf. e.g. p. 190). This is shown by, among others, that chapter which is for the author the most important one, and which has given the book its title. Here Stürmer makes an impressive endeavor to solve both the problem of election and that of the apparently different expectation of the future in I and II Corinthians by referring both exclusively to the fact of Jesus Christ. In him can also be recognized "the unity of Pauline preaching" (p. 186 f.), which Stürmer in concluding sums up briefly thus: "Election is the eternal foundation, resurrection the eternal consummation of the fact of Christ" (p. 186). In his concluding remarks (pp. 187-191) Stürmer believes he can show that neither Luther nor Calvin "has done full justice" to the connection between these two facts (p. 187).

Apart from what has been indicated here, however, Stürmer's understanding of Paul is not always uniform. One can or even must seriously question many of the theses and individual interpretations. Thus it will be possible to use the work to full

advantage only by examining it in regard to its conformity with Paul; but then it will prove a source of abundant help.

Schmithals' work, in spite of the fact that it has in part the same subject, is distinguished from Stürmer's in regard to its treatment of theme, partly in the understanding of Pauline theology, and above all in the understanding of gnosticism as a whole and in consequence especially of Paul's opponents in Corinth. It also differs in form from Stürmer's work. Schmithals' book is much more unified in the arrangement of ideas and in its structure, in which everything seems to dovetail together, not least by means of the long excursus which sketches the history of the concept of the redeemed redeemer and in addition that of early gnosticism in general (which arose in the Judaism of Mesopotamia around 300 B.C.). This sketch is made partly by flying blind over uncharted country, but in such a way that the particular object (announced on p. 117) is achieved: that the idea of the identity of redeemer and redeemed is pre-Christian, and thus the "I am of Christ" of I Cor. 1:12 is to be interpreted in the gnostic (not in the Pauline!) sense as a genitive partitive-the individual "spirit-self", understood as having concrete substance, is an integral part of primitive man, according to gnostic concepts.

The findings in the field of literary criticism also help toward a unified understanding of the gnostic invasion in Corinth. In his first letter Paul has not yet recognized at all the gnostic character of his opponents (II Cor. 6:14-7:1; I Cor. 9:24-10:22; 6:12 -20; 11:2-34; 15 (!); 16:13-24). At the time of the composition of the second letter his information was only slightly better (the rest of I Cor.); even the visit in between did not leave Paul much time to spend with the congregation (following this, the third letter: II Cor. 2:14-6:13; 7:2-4; the letter of lamentation which painted the situation too black: II Cor. 10-13; the fifth letter: II Cor. 0; the letter of rejoicing: II Cor. 1:1-2:13; 7:5-8:24). Paul himself had received a gnostic legacy from Judaism in the idea of cosmic dualism, from pre-Christian gnosticism in the concept of the apostle and in demonology. This legacy was revealed in most cases at least in terminology and imagery (even though almost exclusively in an already Christianized form which was for the most part hardly adequate for Paul's theology),

but also in certain ideas (Rom. 6:3 f.). Nevertheless (and this becomes as important again and again for Schmithals' recognition of the hidden gnostic traits of the Corinthian adversaries as the fact that Paul's information was for a long time imperfect) in spite of this legacy, Paul did not understand at all the gnosticism of the Corinthian intruders (either in regard to form, or even in regard to essential content). True, he succeeds in partially grasping the essential character of the antithesis (the distinction in the understanding of existence), but cannot really understand the basic concern of gnosticism. For example, he cannot comprehend the notion of incorporeal existence (in the anthropological dualism of Hellenistic gnosticism). The missionaries of Jewish origin who have invaded Corinth, who are as a whole representatives of "pure" gnosticism (which attains and already possesses salvation solely through the recognition of man's own spirit-being), radically reject Jesus according to the flesh (thus Godet), and accordingly the Cross and Lord's Supper (Schniewind), the Resurrection, etc.

What is impressive in the work, apart from the wealth of knowledge, the logical sequence of thought, the author's gift of synthesis, is, in regard to the treatment of theme, on the one hand the interpretation, (in part, it is true, very complicated) of some difficult passages of II Corinthians, and on the other hand the coherence of the picture of the Corinthian heresy, which to be sure turns upon the postulation of constant misunderstandings on Paul's part. For Schmithals himself his interpretation stands or falls by this unity-although he at times acknowledges the hypothetical character of individual interpretations. person who quite apart from Schmithals doubts the correctness of these interpretations will ask whether the situation which faces Paul in Corinth is not still more complicated than Schmithals thinks.

Davies' intention is to show that Paul's interpretation of Christianity is based in its central points in an essentially rabbinic world of ideas and is dominated by pharisaic concepts which he has baptized "into Christ" (p. 16). Thus the Pauline understanding of "flesh" and "sin" corresponds to the rabbinic idea of the "evil impulse" (this idea also underlies Rom. 7 and 1). The Jewish concept of Adam in whom

the whole of mankind is comprised stamps the Pauline concept of the second Adam, Christ, who has cosmic significance. Just as the pious Jew for example in the Passover liturgy appropriates to himself the history of his nation, so the Christian takes to himself the destiny of Christ in dying and rising from the dead; Paul preaches a new exodus. His ethical instruction makes use of rabbinic symbols, and the words of Jesus are for him a Christian Halakha: he stood at the foot of a new Sinai. Paul himself throughout his life kept the law in the manner of the Pharisees, observing even in prison, for example, the prescriptions concerning food. His christology takes over the late Jewish concepts of Chokma = Thora: Jesus is the New Thora (Col. 1:15 f.!). And yet what is more important for Paul is that through the Resurrection Christ became the life-giving Spirit. If Paul's concept of the Spirit has a material nuance, it corresponds in this to the Jewish one; it bears no sort of cosmic stamp and is thus thoroughly non-Stoic. The understanding of the Pneuma as a creative Spirit which brings community into being goes back to Judaism. In the interpretation of the death of Christ the idea of the cultic sacrifice recedes in good rabbinic fashion behind that of the covenant. The changes which Paul (!) makes in the account of the Last Supper as it was recorded in the Gospel of Mark are determined by his rabbinic past (the fear of partaking of blood; formula of anamnesis). The following rabbinic ideas are important presuppositions for the Pauline interpretation of the Cross: suffering has an atoning effect; martyrdom is the extreme form of obedience to the thora; obedience to the thora obtains merit for others even to the extent of the forgiveness of sins. It is from this point of view that Rom. 5, for instance, is to be understood.

At times Davies acknowledges the possibility that Paul is not impervious to certain influences coming from outside Palestine. Mostly, it is true, he strives (and frequently with justification) to prove the contrary, even by admitting Hellenistic influences upon Palestinian Judaism (in this of course he has not decided how such influences have found their way to Paul!). It would be necessary to clarify beforehand (more lucidly than in Schmithals) the question of Jewish gnosticism, if one wanted to trace Jewish influences on Pauline theology.

(The restriction of this to the Pharisaism of rabbinic literature must give an inaccurate picture of Paul's historic religious background; Davies himself does not carry

it to its logical conclusion).

Davies has collected a wealth of material (justifiably confining himself as far as possible to the time up to 100 A. D.) and has worked it up into an impressive picture of the "official" piety of Palestine. It is also to his credit that he has posed afresh the question of Paul's relationship to it. Of course it is a pity that Davies could refer only in brief addenda to the Dead Sea discoveries; one must at least ask what was the relationship of the Qumran community to Pharisaism. At decisive points Davies shows how Paul transcends it; occasionally he also points up a certain antithesis. Most certainly, important features of Pauline theology and piety are illumined by him (as in the way in which he takes up a lively discussion with modern literature on certain aspects of the history of religion). But frequently, through the endeavor to approximate it to Pharisaic theology, Pauline theology at least suffers injury, not only in the relegation of justification by faith to the fringe of Pauline theology (it is a doctrine of struggle, a picture which may not be petrified into dogma; Paul has never separated religion and life, says Davies on this point, p. 222). Thus it seems to me that the book needs supplementation, not in the first place as regards the history of religion, but above all in regard to theology-precisely for the sake of the second half of the wish which its author expressed that it may contribute to a more profound understanding of Judaism among Christians and of Pauline Christianity among Jews.

At the center of the book by Seidensticker are "The Death of Christ on the Cross . . ." and "The Christ-Fellowship of believers as a cultic reality of Salvation" (§ 8 f.), cultic understood in the sense that "every form of adoration of God can bear a cultic character, insofar as it is appointed and accepted only by that God for whom it is intended" (V). In contrast to Davies (p. 189) Seidensticker first of all declines fundamentally to "interpret on the grounds of their former content and scope" (p. 151) Paul's theological concepts from the standpoint of the Old Testament or of Judaism (not to mention the area of Hellenism);

"even those cultic forms which are generally comprehensible ... undergo by means of the Christ-event a transformation of content" (p. 150). Apart from this Seidensticker establishes that Paul does not make his statements in dogmatically fixed concepts: moreover he has "only very sparingly made use of statements which are expressly about sacrifice" (p. 172), and among those that are available there are none on "the nature of sacrifice"; thus Paul "never calls Christ the priest" (p. 191). Even though Seidensticker concludes with the finding that the believer is like Christ "priest and sacrifice simultaneously" (p. 320), he expresses this in a "theologically christological manner" (VI). For Seidensticker it is first of all the christological (or trinitarian) bases of the death of Christ which are important: he has brought into his sacrifice not only his full humanity, but also his divinity (p. 177). In the possession of the Spirit by the God-man "lies the reason for Christ's freedom from sin, which enabled him to atone for the sins of others" (p. 182). He is subject and object of the self-surrender (p. 191) which essentially constitutes the sacrifice of Christ. As an act of voluntary obedience it receives "expiatory value", the "value of a meritorious deed" (p. 196; cf. Davies). The Pauline turn of phrase "blood of Christ" is a "factual symbol" with a "material shade of meaning" (p. 155 f.). He who was crucified is one in person with the mystic Christ who is identified with the church (p. 211). In union of being with him, through the "mystical unio (quasi) physica" of the church with the body of the crucified Lord (p. 277) the believers participate in the "cultic nature of the being of Christ's person", in his priesthood (p. 223 f.). They join in the Holy Spirit in consummating the sacrifice on the cross, "in that they are brought into the sacrifice of Christ", they "offer up the sacrifice together with Christ", the sacrifice "which has already been offered up vicariously for all" (Rom. 15:16; p. 227). "The entire life of the Christian" can "be interpreted as an expression of faith and love... as a sacrifice" (p. 255); "in virtuous acts and good works" the sacrificial death of Christ is "so to speak" continued (p. 268). But in the Lord's Supper the church "consummates the ultimate realization of her being as the church which participates in sacrifice" (p. 279). The

sacrifice of the Cross is "uncompleted without fulfillment by the church which joins in consummating it" (p. 262).

Seidensticker once more affirms towards the end that it is impossible "to contain this theological reality in an already available conceptual apparatus" (p. 326). Of course one cannot do biblical-theological work without interpretive concepts. But one must ask (cf. later Schierse) whether terms like physical - historical-real - mystical, nature and the supernatural, outside of space and time, etc., are appropriate to Pauline theology. Seidensticker in fact impresses on it to a considerable extent a certain pattern; moreover even in § 8 f. he interprets the death of Christ expressly using Hebrews as his starting-point; he assumes for this letter an "indirect authorship of the Apostle Paul" (p. 281), and devotes a special section to its doctrine. In individual details the work contains many fine observations of a theological and exegetical nature. In addition the introductory presentation of the Greek-Hellenistic spiritualization of worship (particularly by means of the λογική θυσία of the writings of Hermes), and of the high value attached to worship in Old Testament and late Jewish thought makes stimulating reading. But the book fails to grasp what is decisively important in Paul.

From Seidensticker's work there arose for the Evangelical theologian a question which Eichholz expressly attacks: the question of the canon of the New Testament. It is an absolutely burning question today. If the writings of Luke, through their "primitive catholicism" (Vielhauer), II Peter, through its lack of understanding of true eschatology (Käsemann), Revelation, through its apocalyptic writing, the Gospel of John (or even Ephesians) through its gnosis, all differ theologically from the remainder of the New Testament writings, can one then still speak of a unity of the canon? Eichholz answers this question negatively. But (although he weighs this possibility logically, more so than for example Harbsmeier), he does not abandon the canonicity of the New Testament or of those parts which are suspect, but demands that precisely these shall first "have an opportunity to speak" unabridged (p. 6). The prerequisite for this, according to Eichholz, is a revision of the interpretive categories of present-day exegesis. True exegesis comes "precisely in all its methodological caution to the very boundary of

methodology, ... to its object itself, to the ... reality of the Word of God" (p. 7).

Eichholz deals with the question of the canon merely with reference to James; this is (apart from the fact that it was here that the question became most clearly visible for Luther; Eichholz argues in how far this was so) very significant in that Eichholz in the first place draws a profile of the peculiarities of James in themselves and over against what is specific in Paul, and emphasizes that precisely in the theological sense James is to be taken completely seriously; by this means the possible antithesis to Paul would naturally become critical. Admittedly James no longer enters into conversation with Paul himself, but only with Pauline forms.

Just in this way he has the task of guarding against a mere passing on of Pauline forms (in this connection Eichholz can, apparently "in contradiction to" Luther, cite Kierkegaard!), he has a commission for his time (one may perhaps add: not just one which is past). Eichholz asks whether our reserve in regard to James is not rooted in the fact that we have not yet fully understood Paul. Paul and James are witnesses of the one Lord: herein-without putting their statements on the same level-is their unity (and thus that of the canon) revealed. I am of the opinion that in this significant writing a decisive word has been spoken on the question of the canon in general.

Gerhard Delling

# A Lutheran Theology of Awakening

BIBELN OCH MÄNNISKAN I MAGNUS FRIEDRICH ROOS' TEOLOGI. En systematisk studie i württembergspietism. [The Bible and Man in the Theology of Magnus Friedrich Roos. A Systematic Study in Württemberg Pietism]. By Helge Brattgård. Studia theologica Lundensia 10. Lund: 1955. 403 Pages.

It may appear strange that the Württemberg theologian Magnus Friedrich Roos (1727—1803), who today is scarcely known even in his native country, should have been made the subject of a Swedish dissertation of a theological-systematic character. The

explanation for this lies in the fact that through his writing Roos has exercised a very significant and remarkable influence in Sweden, particularly in those circles of pietistic awakening which have their home on the west coast of Sweden where his books are still read even today.

One very soon becomes convinced, however, that Brattgård's investigation of Roos' theology can prove to be of far more than local interest. This must not of course be understood to mean that through this dissertation Roos is to be represented as one of the great Lutheran theologians. Anyone who expects something of the sort must necessarily be disappointed. Nor is the possibility excluded that those who see in Roos one of their spiritual ancestors may be painfully disillusioned through Brattgård's work. But quite apart from the result of the investigation, the dissertation has its significance in the fact that the form of Württemberg pietism which appears in Roos' theology has been investigated systematically. Yet the author has not contented himself with just that. He has drawn up a much more comprehensive program and, as the reader can see for himself, has carried it out with really impressive skill and expert knowledge.

In fact in Brattgård's investigation Roos' theology takes on its real interest in that it is shown to be an excellent exemplification of a hitherto inadequately studied period in the history of dogma in Lutheranism, that is of that period of transition in which orthodoxy, pietism and the enlightenment came into conflict with each other. In this situation Roos naturally finds himself in the position of an apologist. He defends Lutheran orthodoxy against the enlightenment, but this defense of orthodoxy is undertaken from the presuppositions of pietism. This has as its result the fact that all conscious tension between orthodoxy and pietism is eliminated. Roos thus denotes a significant point on the way toward the union of the piety of awakening and orthodoxy, which represents the confessional theology of the nineteenth century.

Meanwhile Brattgård shows that the defense of Lutheran orthodoxy over against the rationalism of the enlightenment which Roos takes up by no means offers a guarantee that in his own thinking he really succeeded in giving appropriate expression to this orthodoxy. The purport of Brattgård's

principal thesis is that the pietistic hypotheses which determine Roos' religious thought force him into a position which betrays in important points an affinity with the thought of the enlightenment. It is the expressions of this affinity which the author seeks in the first place to trace out in his investigation. Thus the study of Roos' theology becomes essentially more productive than if the author had confined himself to making a detailed investigation of Roos' view as such. Roos' theology is put into the whole context in which it belongs, and indeed not only into the context of Württemberg pietism, but also into the much more comprehensive context of the general theological development of Protestantism of that time. Since till now no generally recognized conclusions have been available in regard to either of these two elements in the history of theology the author felt himself led to undertake thorough studies of his own, which in part have the character of original research. By this means Brattgård's work has acquired fundamental significance both for the understanding of Württemberg pietism and for the later history of the development of Lutheran doctrine.

The sources from which Roos' theology must be sifted consist largely of popular and edifying expositions of the Bible. Because of the nature of the material it is therefore thoroughly proper and significant to make *Holy Scripture* the center of investigation into Roos' theology. The fact that according to Brattgård's interpretation man forms the second focus betrays the tribute that Roos was compelled to pay to general contemporary thought. For the enlightenment man formed the self-evident center, and pietism by no means opposed this orientation but rather supported it.

The first chapter of the dissertation sketches the historical background of contemporary ideas for the investigation of Roos' theology. At various important points the author could not build upon earlier works, since these have often given only insufficient consideration to the systematic context. Long sections of the presentation have therefore the character of an independent and moreover deeply penetrating study in the area of the history of theology. Particularly impressive is the picture which the author sketches of J. A. Bengel (pp. 45–69), the man who stamped no doubt most strongly the character of piety peculiar to

Württemberg. Brattgård meanwhile wants to trace this Swabian peculiarity back to Brenz, who introduced that concentration on Holy Scripture which is characteristic for the theology of Württemberg. The author seeks to point up the factors which invested orthodoxy in Swabia with a "mildly Lutheran character", which is regarded as its really distinguishing mark, and which also explains how pietism was later able to adapt itself to such a high degree to the Swabian "bourgeoisie" ("Bürgertum"), that it was possible for it to be fitted into church life much more naturally than elsewhere.

The second chapter of the dissertation contains a detailed biography of Roos, which must be especially welcomed because of the fact that in Roos we have a figure scarcely known in the history of theology. The author has however turned his attention principally to the relationshop of Roos to contemporary religious and theological tendencies. In this connection it may be mentioned that the author has succeeded in discovering new sources, namely individual documents which at times grew out of the annual disputations on dogmatic questions which Roos as superintendent had instituted for his pastors. By this means the author has been able valuably to supplement and enrich the picture of Roos' theology, which apart from this can be reconstructed only from those writings of his of a predominantly popular character.

After this follows a survey and description of Roos' writings. Here, among other things, the author follows the peculiar course by which Roos' writings reached beyond the borders of Württemberg to Sweden. We learn that the majority of Roos' writings were soon translated into Swedish and that some have appeared even in modern editions. One can further gather from Brattgård's presentation that Roos acquired during a certain period almost the same importance for the religious life of Finland as he had in Sweden, and that his writings were also eagerly read in Finnish. The author mentions moreover that Roos' writings have also been made accessible to Norwegian readers and that his Christliches Hausbuch appeared in 1950 even in Tamil in South India. Thus Roos is shown to be one of the best-known writers of world Lutheranism.

The main part of the presentation is followed by two more chapters entitled "The

Bible" and "Man". Here we are made acquainted with the real problematics of Roos' theology. The author does not find it difficult to verify his main thesis from the sources. Point by point he establishes that in his religious views Roos deviated from classical orthodox Lutheranism to such an extent that it was impossible for him to defend it against the enlightenment. The understanding of Lutheran theology represented by Roos is an understanding modified and deflected in a pietistic sense. It is expressed for example in his understanding of Scripture, when in his efforts to defend the absolute authority of Holy Scripture against the incipient biblical criticism of the enlightenment he makes the inner experience of the biblical writer become the vehicle of inspiration. The truth of Holy Scripture is to be guaranteed through human individuals and their experiences. Individualism forms here the basic understanding common to pietism and the enlightenment. Not even the so-called biblical realism which Roos had taken over as an old Swabian legacy, could, in the author's view, prove itself an effective bulwark against the abstractions of the enlightenment's mode of thinking. The endeavor-which was to a certain degree in opposition to orthodoxyto be "biblical" even in theological terminology facilitated reading into the texts of Holy Scripture a pietistic content of faith and increased the contrast to older Lutheran theology. In the same measure that Roos understood in an intellectualistic way Holy Scripture as the source of true knowledgeand he emphasized this more strongly than the rest of pietism because he had given up opposing orthodoxy and sought rather to defend it-he was obliged once again to go halfway to meet the interest of the enlightenment. What Roos as a pietist was striving for above all was how a pious life in the imitation of Christ was to be given form. The power for such formation of life ought to be given by the Holy Spirit. Yet Roos did not succeed in understanding Word and Spirit as expressions of one and the same divine work. He took rather as Spirit those movements within man which result from the Word but are independent of it. According to Brattgård, Roos is in principle moving here along the same line as the enlightenment, though the enlightenment, it is true, emphasized a different psychological event,

namely, the free decision of the will, convinced by reason, to strive after virtue.

Roos' intention is to base his doctrine of man not on human authorities, but exclusively on Holy Scripture. Yet his dependence on the general contemporary psychology is unmistakable even in this point. The interest prevailing within orthodoxy in the relationship of man to God has for Roos been replaced by a strong interest in the inner and psychical, in what can be experienced and empirically substantiated. Roos' understanding of sin also is individualistically and psychologically determined and reveals the spiritualistic tendency to disparage the bodily in a manner which no longer does full justice to belief in creation. The general eudaemonism of the enlightenment is accepted by Roos without reservation. He takes as his self-evident primary viewpoint, under which the nature of man is to be regarded, the pursuit of happiness. He regards self-love as a primary duty and sees in it the most important point of contact for the atonement, for he understands God as the summum bonum of man. In this way christology too becomes embedded in anthropology. The fact that as a result christology, from a systematic point of view, is pushed to the background and accorded only a very narrow position has been strongly emphasized by Brattgård.

In contrast to the slender interest which christology holds for him, Roos has a very pronounced interest in the realization of redemption in the individual person. Here the pattern of the order of salvation, the ordo salutis, handed down by the tradition of piety, offered itself to Roos. He interpreted this pattern-although Holy Scripture was obviously opposed to it-in a pietistic sense and understood it as an empirical state once the crisis of repentance had been overcome. Accordingly for Roos Law and Gospel are two different means, both of which are to serve man, but in two different stages of religious development. Strictly speaking, in the state of grace upon which man has entered at his conversion the Law has no longer any place or any validity.

Roos sees the church too under an individualistic-spiritualistic distortion. For him the church is an entity, which is based on a fellowship of men with certain religious experiences. The distance between the concept of both the Bible and the Lutheran Reformation in this point is made particularly clear.

It must be viewed as extremely prudent that the author has refrained from approaching this subject with a yardstick drawn from the Bible and the Reformation. Brattgård has instead confined himself to placing Roos and his theology in relationship to orthodoxy, with whose concepts Roos indeed had declared himself to be at one. The result of this study shows nevertheless in all clarity that one cannot infer from the mere fact of benevolence towards the theology of a past age that there is real affinity with this theology.

With this dissertation, which runs to 400 pages, Brattgård has presented Lutheran theology with a solid study in the area of theological history, an investigation which exhibits all the merits of Swedish scholarly tradition. It has been written-although in carrying out his program the author had to struggle with considerable difficulties-with as much decisiveness as expert knowledge. Brattgård's aim was not only to sketch a picture of Roos' theology, but also to fit this theology into the context of contemporary history, without which it can hardly be rightly understood or appraised. If the result should be that the theological point of view which is actually the main object of investigation captivates the reader less than the broad outlines of religious thought with the aid of which the author seeks to make it clear and enliven it, that is in the nature of the case and must be so accepted. In any case Brattgård's work is of such high caliber that it must surely be only a question of time before it is made accessible through translation to those who speak German.

Helge Nyman

# Luther's Exegesis

LUTHER ALS AUSLEGER DER SYNOP-TIKER [Luther as Interpreter of the Synoptics] (Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus, 2. Reihe, Bd. V). By Walther von Loewenich. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1954. 305 pages, 8vo. Paper 17,50 DM, cloth 20,00 DM.

Recently interest in Luther's theology has turned more and more to his interpretation of Holy Scripture. Luther did not intend to build up a theological system, but as a "doctor of the Holy Scriptures" he wished to give expression to the biblical message. Therefore, he emphasized faithfulness to the text and its exposition rather than to a specific systematic thought sequence. Certainly he succeeded in finding in Christ Jesus the unity of this message, but he has also shown the wealth and variety of its many aspects.

Walther von Loewenich's work arises from the need to show that Luther was not proclaiming a half-truth but that he listened to the totality of the message (i. e. that he was a "Vollhörer der Bibel"). Usually it is thought that Luther launched a Paulinistic interpretation of the Gospel. The author questions whether this is a balanced judgment. For even though Luther did emphasize certain aspects of Pauline thought, the question arises whether by doing so Luther was not able to spread light upon the total biblical message. The scriptural character of a theological thought does not consist in a combination of the different types of doctrine presented in the Bible but takes expression in a clear confession to the decisive act of God in Jesus Christ.

Examining Luther's interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels, the author acknowledges that Luther's exegesis was the best of his time, although it cannot be accepted without reservations in our time as an exegetical method. Nevertheless, the interpretation offered by Luther has in a remarkable way through its christocentric character penetrated the center of the message. In this it presents Luther as a faithful hearer of the Word. The author demonstrates that Luther pursued an existential exegesis in which Scripture and Christian experience were finely balanced. Exegesis was for him an obedient act of faith. Luther's interpretation was an application of the redemptive acts of God for the individual rather than the recitation of the historic events of the faith.

Although the author is positive in regard to Luther's finding the scope of the message in Christ, he also has objections regarding details in the Reformer's interpretation of the Synoptics. Such objections he raises in regard to Luther's concept of the Christian life as a following of Christ or to his coordination of faith and love. One may not deny

that there are elements of truth in this criticism. However, the charge that Luther has "actually spiritualized the synoptic concept of the Kingdom" (den synoptischen Reichsgedanken durchaus spiritualisiert) (p. 211) seems to be an overstatement. It is clear that Luther's interpretation has a tendency to actualize the coming Kingdom. Nevertheless, this is far from a spiritualization or even a tendency toward "demythologization". More adequately it can be defined as a type of realism, and the author has himself listed examples of this.

A study of Luther as an interpreter of the Synoptics is a healthy sign of a new theological orientation. Instead of producing Luther's thought, it is more interested in the examination of the claim Luther himself made, that is, that he was an interpreter of the Scriptures, a messenger of Christ. It is proof of the greatness of his theology that Luther can stand up to critical examination hundreds of years later. Vilmos Vajta

## The Church in Asia

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ASIAN RE-VOLUTION. Edited by Rajah B. Manikam. Madras: Christian Literature Society, 1954. 293 pages, 3 Rs.

THE CHURCH IN SOUTHEAST ASIA.

By W. T. Thomas and Rajah B. Manikam.

New York: Friendship Press, 1956. 171

pages, \$ 2.50.

In the area under consideration, from Pakistan to Japan, lives more than half of mankind, about 1,250,000,000 people. Among these there are only 40 million Christians, of whom barely 13 million are Protestants. Along with Africa, these are chiefly the regions from which those "representatives of the ecumenical world" come who make the greatest impression and are most gladly received among us. And their appearance among us so stirs and amazes us that we forget only too often and too easily the 97 % who are still "outside" and of whom Christ "was also thinking when he cried: 'It is finished!" The authors, who are mostly Asians, complain however that both the western missions and the Asian Christians have up to the present shown a

completely inadequate concern for the "total witness" of the Gospel.

The writers undertake a thorough examination. With numerous quotations of facts and figures they portray the situation, undertake an analysis and also give their interpretation. Which of the two books should be designated as more valuable is hard to say. Anyone who, as a Christian. theologian and responsible churchman. wants to orient himself in regard to the actual political change, "the revolution", in regard to the extent, the life and the struggle of the church in this area of stirring events, and who wants to join in the conversation as intelligibly as possible, must study both books. Both have a clear objective. Each gives in its last chapter very cheerless statements on the "uncompleted task" and summons the churches of Europe and America to extensive and intensive partnership. Unfortunately both books leave the reader without the help of an index, which is absolutely necessary for the constant evaluation of the material. We do not easily tire of pointing continually to this defect in many new books and asking the writers not to leave the reader without such an important aid to his work when he has finished the book and is eager to profit by the material.

In these two books especially the material is so revelant for the present day and of such great importance that it deserves to be passed on. In the Asian Revolution we are informed about the revolutionary events in the political, economic and social fields and also about the attitude of the Christians to the revolution.

Particularly valuable are the well-documented statements on the renewal of strength of the various religions (the awakening of Hinduism, Buddhism on the march, Islam today, new religions in eastern Asia). The church can no longer afford, either from a realistic biblical standpoint or for the continuance of its very existence, to have members, including shepherds of congregations, leaders of the churches and teachers in professorial positions, who know appallingly little of the various religions, of their claims to absoluteness, the development of their forces and their aims for conquering the world, and take just as little notice of them. In spite of all the baptism of pagans, the church is continually growing smaller in relation to the alarming

growth in the number of pagans caused by an amazing increase in the birth-rate (there have never been so many pagans as there are today!). World statistics have already confirmed that. This must be seen and set in the right relationship to the often overemphasized ecumenical enthusiasm of our day. It is a question of taking a realistic view of the world! What the Indian Principal of Bangalore, Russel Chandran, writes in a brilliant chapter about the approach to, and contact and discussion with, the pagan religions belongs, so to speak, to the theological daily work of the church and to its theological study. The unity of the church, say the writers of our books, must be seen these days also in the fact that the older brethren in the "old churches" do not leave their younger brethren in the "young churches" alone in their encounters with the pagan religions around them which often threaten them with a syncretistic force of absorption, encounters which strike at their very being and demand profound theological insight. Instead, the older brethren should give theological and practical help to their younger brethren. For here too it is the whole church which is involved.

What is written in the first book, in the space of only 58 pages, about the churches in the new Asian environment, is expanded and treated more profoundly in the second book in 168 (smaller) pages. At the same time it is clear that much more and much that is different could be written about the young churches. But that is true of every book of this nature. Therefore we do not need to stop to notice small deficiencies and omissions, since what is offered is adequate and good. We learn what it is necessary to know about the religious climate and the population of those countries, about the history of the church and the characteristic features of the minority churches, which over against "the enormous Goliath of the non-Christian religions and cultures, communism and growing secularism" look like "a diminutive David".

Thus it is from country to country, from island to island. And this whole area, especially since the end of the second world war, is a hunting ground for the sects!

It is hoped that the readers will march with the times and free themselves of old conceptions. The young churches may no longer be regarded as "extensions of the western churches", but as what they in fact are: autonomous Christian fellowships, as "indigenous units", which as such consciously and joyfully emphasize and cultivate association and unity with the churches of the whole world. Indeed, they urgently ask for manpower and material assistance. At the same time they speak candidly of the new type of missionary ("they must be patient too"!). And they ask for American collaborators who are Negroes, Orientals, Indians and Mexicans! Missionaries do not always have to be white people!

The "new significant fact" that there are churches which are "fully Asian" in their pastors and members must be respected, and accordingly these churches must really be treated as equals. There is no doubt about it that the western churches can now do only what their "sister churches" (not: young churches!) ask of them. "Church colonies" are entirely a thing of the past, and imported western theology cannot be retained either. It is emphatically stated that the entire work should be regarded and treated more and more as a whole. The Christians of Asia "cooperate in a measure which is unheard of in the countries in which the (confessional) differences first arose".

As a Lutheran, one can indeed only wish that the prevailing Reformed tendencies in the whole area should come closer together and unite more than hitherto. There is the example of Tonga. The almost entirely Christian population of 49,000 of the island has three churches. The divisions had nothing to do with doctrine. It was a matter of very un-theological factors: of struggles for power!

As one mentally traverses this enormous area, it is striking that in the Asian churches and therefore also in the two books not only is there little mention of "Lutheran", but that there is also relatively little to be found of Lutheran work and the Lutheran church. The small harvest corresponds completely to the meagreness of the participation in the sowing. The picture becomes even more disgraceful when one calls to mind that the great Batak church, which is now a member of the Lutheran World Federation, was founded and has been nurtured not by a Lutheran mission, but by a Union-Church mission.

We Lutherans are also included when the writers of our two books speak of the urgency of the task: "The evangelization of the world in this generation and in every generation is the continuing reponsibility of the total world Christian community".

Arno Lehmann

### IN PLACE OF A "GENEVA DIARY"

At this moment the guns are silent in the Near East — at least according to formal agreement between the diplomatic representatives and military leaders. And in Hungary what in many parts of the world is called "order" has been reestablished. We have become aware of the abyss over which we live today, suspended on a taut rope footbridge whose strength and capacity no one dares to measure. Perhaps tomorrow some other more vital cord will snap, with more profound consequences. Perhaps we shall all be plunged into the abyss. What appears to be the isolated fate of a few individual places in the world, which we hope by our activity to isolate, is actually the fate of us all, is the abyss of contradictions which we all bear within us. To solve these contradictions we not only lack the power, but — much more — also the insight, the love and the discipline. The orders and the ideologies in which we live—or think we live—no longer ring true. They are mere letters, lifeless, or even death-dealing. They are forms whose existence one can construe on paper without thereby expressing anything more than a relationship between two mathematical abstractions, forms which one would like to maintain until the Judgment, or until the appearance of some propitious miracle.

But we have no right to rationalize with this history, which we ourselves experience and in which we participate, to gesture boldly into the darkness or to clothe ourselves in the — as some would say — fashionable cloak of pessimism. We are not philosophers of history, but as members of the church of Jesus Christ we are brethren who together must face the fate of present-day history among many peoples on many continents and against very diverse forms of religion, fanaticism and superstition. And the events of recent weeks have not only made us aware of an abyss, but have also made us sense at any rate that God

with his church does not abandon men even in this abyss.

We have decided not to bring this time the "Geneva Diary" of the Executive Secretary of the Federation. The report which we had before us was written by Dr. Lund-Quist on the basis of impressions he received at the meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches last summer during the negotiations carried on (together with Bishop Hanns Lilje and Dr. Franklin Clark Fry) with the Hungarian government at the time regarding the rehabilitation of Bishop Ordass, and also on the basis of a visit paid to the Lutheran churches in Poland and Czechoslovakia the last week of September. The report, outdated by the events which have just taken place, contained news of persons and conditions about which we find ourselves today in painful uncertainty. We know little about our Lutheran brethren in Hungary and the publication of such reports would only magnify the confusion. We are the more thankful and moved, therefore, to read especially now in Dr. Lund-Quist's report a testimony to the cause of God, made in the midst of precisely this world.

He wrote then:

"In our visits with Bishop Ordass we found that he was a spiritually unbroken man. There is no trace of bitterness, hatred or malice. His main concern is to serve the church in whatever way is open to him. He repeatedly emphasized that the person of Ordass is not important but the cause of the church is paramount."

And some weeks later Dr. Lund-Quist summarized the impressions he obtained in

Poland and Czechoslovakia in this way:

"The leading men of the church themselves said they have many difficult problems and questions. The important fact is that the church exists and functions, there are living congregations, the Gospel is being preached, the sacraments are being administered. Many of us understand much better the heavy responsibility resting upon the church leaders and pastors in leading their people in faithful witness to the Christian faith. There have been misconceptions of the life of our churches on both sides. Much of what has been written in the west is inaccurate. Many of our people in these countries are uninformed about the purposes and functions of the W.C.C. and the L.W.F. The necessity of further visits and contacts is quite obvious. We hope that they will be possible."

Not only have these lines not lost any of their relevance, but they have taken on even more. For they make clear now what we often miss in mutual words of official greetings on the part of church officials and in press reports, which are often very cautious in view of given circumstances. Behind the sometimes questionable and ofttimes too smoothly polished forms of ecclesiastical institution and bureaucracy there stands the reality of the church of Christ which suddenly begins to shine forth in the darkness of history. The witness of the church evidently is decisively bound neither to the quality of preaching, nor to correct liturgical or church order, nor to the theological mastering of the great intellectual problems of the present. We are consciously speaking here of things to which the Christian and the theologian are in duty bound, according to their best knowledge and conscience. But one can only talk about the Third Article with the caution of one who really knows that the Spirit bloweth where he listeth and that there is no human gurantez either for or against this sovereignty of the Holy Spirit.

The events of these past days are for all of Christendom a summons to humility and responsibility. We can only pray that in the hour of affliction we may have the right word, the right order, the right insight to witness to the truth of God. God moves in history, in the history of peoples and of churches. Of this the reports and articles in this very number are a living witness. But in this movement of God we may be assured that in all that has happened his name will be hallowed, his kingdom come, and his will be done on earth as

it is in heaven.

Hans Bolewski

### EDITORIAL NOTES

The main articles in this issue arose largely out of conversations which the churches and confessions are carrying on one with another. The contribution by Professor Jaroslav PELIKAN, of Chicago, was first given at the meeting of the Theological Commission on Tradition and Traditions-American Section-of the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches. The work by Professor Peter BRUNNER, of Heidelberg, is being published in our journal in German and English, after appearing in French in a collection of essays on German Catholicism published by the Editions du Cerf. Paris. In this essay, which is addressed directly to the Catholic readers, we have undertaken only minor editorial changes with the agreement of author and publisher. Also derived from the interconfessional conversation is the contribution by Dr. Rudolf STAEHLIN of Munich (formerly Neuendettelsau), which was delivered as a lecture at the last meeting of the Una Sancta movement, that is, of the meeting of Protestants and Catholics, chiefly from Germany. We are glad to have in this context also for the first time a work on patristics by Professor Hermann DÖRRIES of Göttingen, and we hope that reflection on the Third Article will help in answering the very difficult and serious question which the Anglican Bishop, Stephen Neill, puts to Lutheranism in his letter published here.

A substantial proportion of our ecumenical reports originated in the commission meetings of the Lutheran World Federation. Such are the contribution by Dr. Fredrik A. SCHIOTZ, President of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (North America) and Chairman of the LWF Commission on World Missions, and the two articles by Dr. Arne SOVIK, Geneva, the Assistant Director of the LWF Department of World Missions. All three articles are connected with the commission meeting in Hurdal Verk, Norway, August 9–15, to which we drew attention on page 153 of our last issue. Similarly Dr. Hans Weissgerber, Assistant to the Director of the Department of Theology, in the last issue described the Congress for Luther Research in Aarhus, Denmark, August 13–19, on which Professor Ernst KAEHLER of Greifswald, Germany, reports here. The presentation dealing with theological education in India is an excerpt from the report given by the Director of the LWF Department of Theology, Dr. Vilmos VAJTA, at the last meeting of the Commission on Theology at Göteborg, Sweden, August 20–28. The report on the meeting of the Commission on World Service was written by Miss A. Jean OLSON, Staff Reporter and World Service Information Secretary of the LWF Department of Information.

For the reports from the member churches we are again grateful to a series of new contributors to our journal. The report from India comes from Pastor J. D. ASIRVADAM, Madras. In the area of questions between church and industry Dr. Theo J. PRETZLAFF is working in the United States as Director of Church-Industry Relations of the Board of Social Action of the American Lutheran Church. Professor Theobald SUSS teaches systematic theology at the Protestant Theological Faculty in Paris, Mr. Laimons PAVULS is representative for Churches-in-Exile with LWF/World Service in Bielefeld, Germany.

Books have been reviewed by: Docent Dr. Gunnar Hillerdal (Lund, Sweden), The Foundations of Dogmatics; Professor Gerhard Delling (Halle/Saale, Germany), Pauline Theology; Dr. Helge Nyman (Turku, Finland), A Lutheran Theology of Awakening; Dr. Vilmos Vajta (Geneva, Switzerland), Luther's Exegesis; Professor Arno Lehmann (Halle/Saale,

Germany), The Church in Asia.

# LUTHERAN WORLD publication of the

#### LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

#### Editorial Board:

Bishop Dr. Hanns Lilje, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, Bishop Johannes Smemo Bishop Gerhard May, Dr. Rudolf Weeber, Dr. Carl E. Lund-Quist

#### Editor:

The Rev. Dr. Hans Bolewski, Evangelical Academy, Loccum/Wunstorf (Hann.) Germany

Assistant for the English Language Edition:
Paul E. Hoffman,
17 route de Malagnou, Geneva/Switzerland

#### Publishers:

Sonntagsblatt Inc., Jenischstr. 48, Hamburg-Kleinflottbek/Germany

Printers: Flensburger Druckeret, Nikolaistraße 7, Flensburg

Lutheran World is a quarterly with an English and a German edition (German edition: Lutherische Rundschau)

Regular subscription rate for one year \$ 1.75

Regular subscription rate for two years \$ 3.00

Price of each copy \$ 0.50 or its equivalent in local currencies

Orders can be sent directly to the publishers or
For the United States to: National Lutheran Council, 50 Madison Avenue, New york 10, N. Y. (USA)
For Canada to: National Committee, 237 King Street W., Kitchener, Ontario (Canada)
For Australia to: Lutheran Book Depot, 19 O'Connell Street, North Adelaide / South Australia
or directly to: Department of Information, Lutheran World Federation, 17 route de Malagnou,

Geneva / Switzerland

# LITERATURE SURVEY

A REVIEW OF RECENT THEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS

PUBLISHED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

NR. 2

1956

## Biblical Theology

KERYGMA UND MYTHOS BEI DAVID FRIEDRICH STRAUSS UND RUDOLF BULTMANN. By Gunther Backhaus. Hamburg: Herbert Reich Evangelischer Verlag, 1956. 100 pp. 6,00 DM.

This paper was presented to the theological faculty at Mainz as a doctor's dissertation. It is now published as No. 9 in the series "Theologische Forschung". It is a contribution toward the clarification of the problem of demythologization. By comparing Strauss and Bultmann it can be shown that for example in the understanding of Scripture and Myth there are agreements but also disagreements at crucial points. As a dialectical theologian Bultmann is able to speak of the Holy Scriptures as revelation, which Strauss could not do. In Bultmann's thinking the proclamation is decisive for the interpretation of myth which, as the author emphasizes, Bultmann understands primarily as a means of expression. In a critical approach to the discussion of the problem to date, the author raises questions in regard to the points in which Bultmann's view of the proclamation is based upon the result of his historical critical research. In principle the author summarizes the findings of his studies thus: Strauss speaks of myth, Bultmann interprets the kerygma.

THE IDEA OF REVELATION IN RECENT THOUGHT. By John Baillie. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956. 152pp. \$ 3.00.

The author begins with an historical outline of his subject in the Christian theology of the 17th and 18th centuries. He then traces the more recent contributions

which reject particularly the conception of revelation as a divine supplement to natural theology in favor of God's personal selfrevelation.

MYT OCH HISTORIA I PSALTAREN [Myth and history in the psalter.] By Harris Birkeland. Translation of the Norwegian manuscript by Carl Martin Edsman. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1955. 45 pages. Sw. Cr. 2.00.

The author, professor for Semitic languages at the University of Oslo, presents here in somewhat popular and concise form the results of a larger study in the psalms which appeared a bit later. The Evildoers in the Book of Psalms, Oslo: 1955. He is concerned to emphasize over and against some Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian Old Testament scholars the independence of the psalms in relation to similar oriental poetry. He maintains that the scheme of extra-Israelitic religious composition developed by these scholars on the basis of recently discovered texts taken from the environment of the OT. cannot be transferred to the corresponding Old Testament psalms. As the strongest argument for this thesis, the author shows that the "enemies" mentioned in the psalms are not legendary figures but historical persons, a thesis, moreover, which should be able to find support in the contrast of the religion of the psalms, which is in general national and well-disposed to sacrifice, with the universal and anti-cultic attitude of the prophets.

FRI OCH FRIGJORD [Free and Liberated]. By Erik Esking. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1956. 131 pp. Sw. Crs. 8.00.

This is an exegetical study prepared for the pastors' conference of the Strängnäs diocese. It presents the New Testament concept of freedom as an essential part of the New Testament message on justification. After examining the hellenistic background, the author presents the Old Testament concept of election as the key to the understanding of the Jew's consciousness of freedom (John 8:33).

The author presents the exegetical material on the subject under the headings: God's Liberating Act in Christ, God's People, New Creation, and The Freedom of the Apostle. It is on the basis of some selected main passages that each aspect is introduced. Therefore, it is rather a thorough exegetical study of some texts, yet the systematic basis is adequately manifested in the clear outline of the study. This book is helpful for all those who wish an exegetical orientation on the theme for the forthcoming LWF Assembly.

THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY. By Charles Fritsch. New York: Macmillan, 1956. 192 pp. \$ 3.00.

A new study on the Dead Sea scrolls and the Essenes, of which pre-Christian Jewish sect the Qumran Community probably formed a part, as the book indicates. Following the story of the discovery of the manuscripts, the author shows how they give insight into the life, practices, and teachings of a Jewish monastic community, probably Essenes, located in the vicinity of the Wadi Qumran, and brings out clearly the significance of these documents for Biblical studies.

DAS EVANGELIUM DES MATTHAEUS [The Gospel of Matthew.] By Ernst Lohmeyer; ed. by Werner Schmauch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. 429 pages. DM 26,00.

Following upon the great commentary on Mark edited by Werner Schmauch from the last notes of Ernst Lohmeyer and issued a few years ago, an exposition of the Gospel of Matthew in the Meyer Series of Critical Exegetical Commentaries has now appeared. The structure remains within the framework that the Meyer commentaries have always had. Since Lohmeyer, because of the events following the war, was not able himself to prepare his extensive comments

and rough drafts for printing, Werner Schmauch has edited that which was left behind. Thus a commentary has been produced which represents a coordinated elaboration, without disturbing Lohmeyer's exegesis.

DER EVANGELIST MARKUS [The Evangelist Mark]. By Willy Marxsen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. 149 pages.

Following a stimulus from Ernst Schniewind, the author has undertaken to draw out in detail the situation out of which the kerygma of the Gospels is to be understood. He investigates precisely those passages in the Gospel of Mark which ordinarily receive little treatment by the scholars - framework and editing - and attemps to draw conclusions from them. While form criticism analyzed the traditional and collected material which one finds in the Gospels and was thus more concerned about individual passages, the author concerns himself with editorial remarks and arrangement. He calls his investigation therefore a contribution to the history of editing as well. An essential thesis for Marxsen is that there is no synopsis; that the Gospels cannot be compared synoptically with one another, even when they bring the same material. The author proceeds from the position that Mark interprets his material by its arrangement, and he seeks to show by means of a few examples how the composition of Mark was further developed in the so-called large Gospels. The most important conclusion of his "editorial study" is that the Gospel of Mark is one sermon. The material drawn from tradition is worked over and oriented to the concrete contemporary situation. The expectation of the imminence of the parousia determines directly the tenor of the Gospel. The Gospel of Matthew is a collection of sermons; Luke is an historian.

INTERPRETATATIONES AD VETUS TESTAMENTUM PERTINENTES SIG-MUNDO MOWINCKEL SEPTUAGENARIO MISSAE [Interpretations pertaining to the Old Testament for Sigmund Mowinckel on his seventieth birthday.] Oslo: Forlaget Land og Kirke, 1955. 183 pages.

This anniversary volume [Festschrift] comprises fifteen articles in English, French

or German, of which many in one way or another touch upon the series of problems involved in "cult and prophecy". W.F. Albright brings an addendum to his article on Ps. 68 ("A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems - Ps. LXVII" in Hebrew Union College Annual, XXXIII/1, 1950-1951, pp. 1-39.) and some Canaanitic parallels to Ps. 134:3. A. Alt attempts to prove from Micah 2:1-5 that the prophet's expectation of salvation was in the form of a kingdom to arise out of Bethlehem, but not directly connected with the Davidic line. Some remarks on the history of the Hebrew language are made by H. Birkeland from a comparison of the Masoretic text with corresponding texts from Qumran. N. A. Dahl offers an article on the origin of baptism and attempts to understand the baptism of John by characterizing its religious roots, while O. Eissfeldt works out, by means of a comparison of the pseudo-Philonian Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and the corresponding Old Testament books from Genesis to II Sam 1 the technique of composition of the author in order to provide aids for the literary analysis of the Pentateuch and the historical books of the OT. R. Gyllenberg concerns himself with the series of problems connected with "cult and revelation" in ancient Israel and today, and P. Humbert presents three notes on Gen. 1. By calling attention to the corresponding passage of DSJa, F. Hvidberg expresses the opinion that Is. 6:13 is not speaking about a "root," but about masseboth, while A. R. Johnson investigates the significance of Hesed and Hasid, A. S. Kapalrud explains the story of the sacrifice of the seven sons of Saul (II Sam. 21:1-14) in the light of an old fertility cult rite and J. Lindblom interprets the "corner stone" and the "building" in Is. 28:16 as the spiritual creation of Jahweh, as "unadulterated Jahweh religion", "whose chief elements are faith, law and righteousness." C. R. North takes issue with Torrey and Simon, accepting the exilic origin and mythological interpretation of Second Isaiah; M. Noth discusses the question as to whether in Daniel 7 the phrase "the saints of the Highest" contains ideas on the company around God in heaven and an imminent kingdom of God; and J. Pedersen occupies himself with the interpretation of the tempter in Genesis 3. Finally, E. Sjöberg quotes Justin Martyr as a witness to faith

in the hidden and suffering Messiah in the Judaism of the second century A. D.

## Historical Theology

HAMANN - STUDIEN [Studies on Hamann] By Fritz Blanke. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1956. 126 pp. Sw. Fr. 16.60.

The author, professor of church history in Zürich, presents here a number of different studies on Hamann in whom interest has lately been revived. These papers have been published before in various periodicals which are scarcely available today. In all these papers Blanke shows that Hamann, living in the midst of the 18th century, was the great enemy of the Enlightenment but that he did not succeed in overcoming it. In this way he developed a concept of language opposed to that generally held (Gottessprache und Menschensprache) and took up his pen against the great writer and critic Lessing (Hamann und Lessing), But his non-conformity to the times appears especially in his theological thinking. He felt himself "the revivalist of Luther's faith". This side of his thinking is treated in two articles, (Hamann als Theologe and Hamann und Luther). The last papers (Der junge Hamann and Hamann und die Fürstin Gallitzin) deal with two periods of his life and are of a more biographical nature. The first deals with Hamann's stay in London and the origin of his Biblischen Betrachtungen, the latter with that most impressive encounter with Roman Catholicism at the end of his life.

LUTHER IM SPIEGEL DER DEUTSCHEN GEISTESGESCHICHTE [Luther in the mirror of the history of German thought.] By Heinrich Bornkamm. Heidelberg: Verlag Quelle und Meyer, 1956. 357 pages, DM 21.00.

The first part of the book gives an account of the lively discussion about Luther from the time of the Reformation until now. The second part, which is somewhat longer, offers quotations from the writings of the most important of the authors dealt with in the first part. After an introductory survey

of evaluations of Luther from the time of the Reformation to the Enlightenment, the more detailed presentation begins with the understanding of Luther held by the German classicists (Lessing, Goethe, Schiller) and the theologian Hamann. The picture of Luther painted by the idealist philosophers is represented in the examples of Fichte and Hegel, that of the Romantic critics of this picture in Schlegel, Novalis and others. A rather large section is devoted to the historical investigation of Luther by Ranke, and to the appreciation or criticism which he found among the philosophers of the nineteenth century, Schopenhauer, Feuerbach, Nietzsche and Kierkegaard, up to Dilthey. The book in conclusion gives an insight into the development of the new picture of Luther as it has arisen in both Protestant and Catholic theological research starting with the works of Ricarda Huch and Karl Holl on Luther and continuing through the works of the historians and philosophers of the present day. In the second part, in extracts of texts which are in part very detailed, are expressed the views of 34 writers, from Lessing to the scholars of our time. In the investigation of the way the various epochs took issue with Luther, the writer evolves a certain "law", firstly of a legend existing around Luther, then of the criticism which succeeded it and finally of the incipient new understanding of the Reformer.

DEN EUROPEISKA KONFESSIONSPOLI-TIKENS UPPLÖSNING 1654—1660. [The Dissolution of European Confessional Politics]. By Sven Göranson. Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1956. 365 pp. Sw. Crs. 34.00.

By investigating a comparatively short period, the time of King Charles X, the author shows how in politics religious motivations were more and more pushed to the side by the goals of political realism. From this point of view he investigates various events after the 30 Years' War, the negotiations between Sweden and Cromwell's England, Sweden's policy toward Poland and Prussia. He points out, however, that besides those politically realistic motivations, the politics of these countries was still determined to a great extent by the struggle for the unity of Protestantism, and that certain apocalyptic ideas (Co-

menius) and, above all, unionistic tendencies came into play. Of course, the efforts for Protestant unity have never been completely free from motives of power, politics and other highly secular motives. Often goals of a Christian or ecclesiasticopolitical nature are made to camouflage the pursuit of a certain foreign or even sometimes domestic policy. It is not so easy to determine the borderline between politics grown out of Christian responsibility and mere efforts for political power, especially in this period. At the end of this development especially in the period studied by the author one can see the factor that was clearly to become decisive for all political action: State Absolutism. A summary of the contents in German is attached.

LUTHER — Essai biographique [Luther — a biographical essay] By Albert Greiner. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1956. 203 pp. Sw.Fr. 6.65.

In the Christian renewal that characterizes present-day France Luther is receiving a large share of attention. In this respect this book, written by a Parisian parish pastor, meets a real need. Its scope is perhaps best characterized by comparing it with Bishop Lilje's biography of Luther, known to the German and English reader alike. Like Lilje, Greiner (and his illustrator E. Lovy) began by setting the stage of the 16th century on which Luther is called to act. From here they retrace the familiar stages of the Reformer's evolution (spiritual combat in the monastery, the fatal year of 1517, the great reformation writings, Wartburg Castle, the Peasants' War) to Luther as a church leader and as a Christian man in home and state. Greiner's essay thus concentrates on the years before the Diet of Augsburg and the Augsburg Confession transformed the Lutheran Reformation from one man's struggle to a fact accepted by a large part of the Church. One final chapter shows us the "old Luther" with his daily work and struggle against adversaries on all sides. Without any scientific apparatus Greiner's work is yet theological in the sense that it finds the key to the Reformer's life and work in the claim made upon him by the Christian message that he was called to teach.

GRUNDTVIG-STUDIER 1955 [Grundtvig Studies 1955]. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1956.

These studies were published on Grundtvig's birthday, September 8, 1955, by the Grundtvig Society formed in 1947. They form the eighth volume of a series. The present volume contains a fairly long essay on Grundtvig and English liberalism, which makes a valuable contribution to the understanding of Grundtvig's idea of freedom and to the Grundtvigian relationship to politics in general. In addition we find an essay on Grundtvig as a cultural psychologist. This essay is by W. Michelsen, who recently published his doctor's thesis on Grundtvig's conception of history. This thesis is reviewed in this yearbook together with the other literature on Grundtvig in the same years 1953-1954. We may also mention the following writings included in the contents: the publication of hitherto unprinted writings with explanations; Grundtvig's diary for 1813; a rhyming letter which Grundtvig wrote to his first wife Lise on their 17th wedding anniversary; and finally a speech he gave in the "Danske Samfund" in 1841. The book contains an English synopsis of the essay and articles in it.

TEOLOGINS HISTORIA [The History of Theology] By Bengt Hägglund. Lund: CWK Gleerups Förlag, 1956. 306 pp. Sw. Cr. 18.00.

This is a compendium of the history of Christian dogma. The author defines his task as a record of the way theology worked with the basic Christian dogma. Dogma is not a formal concept for him but rather the content of the articles of the creeds of early Christianity.

There are three main emphases in his book, namely, Augustine, Luther and the period of Lutheran orthodoxy. Nevertheless, the author presents a complete record of the history of theology from the apostolic fathers to the 19th century. Contemporary theology is only mentioned in the last few pages without giving more than just important names.

The book is intended to give the reader an introduction into the history of the theological developments in the church. It is not overloaded with names and dates, but seeks to give a general review of the main lines of theological thinking.

MYTHE OG KULT I GRUNDTVIGS SALMEDIGTNING [Myth and worship in Grundtvig's hymnwriting.] By Søren Holm. Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag, 1955.

The author is professor for systematic theology at the University of Copenhagen. In his book he uses an unexpected and unusual aspect of Grundtvig's psalmody, which he considers from the point of view of comparative religion. His inference is that Grundtvig in a highly gifted way reexperiences the old myths and, as the old popular religions, brings myth into connection with worship. It is clear from his hymns that for Grundtvig Christianity is not a doctrine which arises out of dogma and effects only death and sterility. Instead of this it is life. renewal and conservation of life, and these can be created only by worship. Grundtvig's hymns are therefore not instructive but cultic. We can rediscover in them all those elements which are known in comparative religion as constituents of the popular religions, namely, the mythological image of the world of the natural and supernatural, of poignant dualism and the conflict of the cosmic powers contained in it, myths of the Beginning and the End, the repetition of earliest history in worship. God as the guest at the festival of worship, and belonging with this the mythical communion between God and the congregation, whose adoration culminates in the exultation of worship, also belong among these constituents.

GESETZ UND FREIHEIT. Das Problem des tertius usus legis bei Luther und die neutestamentliche Paränese. [Law and Freedom. The problem of the third use of the Law in Luther and the exhortative passages of the New Testament]. By Wilfried Joest. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2nd edition 1956. 242 pp. DM 18,50

This is an almost unchanged reprint of the first edition published in 1951. The author attempts to answer the question of the right understanding of the Law, as raised by Karl Barth, by means of an interpretation of Luther. According to Luther there is no application of the Law for the

justified person (tertius usus legis), yet the Christian needs the guidance of God to confirm in the right manner, the joy of his faith, (usus practicus evangelii). To correct Luther's understanding of the Law would mean to criticize the center of his thinking. In Part II of the study, the author asks how Luther's doctrine is related to the New Testament. Thus he takes seriously the Holy Scriptures as the critical authority in this guestion. It is not difficult to show that important passages of the NT are the basis of Luther's doctrine. The attempt to limit those passages contradicting Luther (judgment according to works) to certain writings of the NT (e. g. James) or to eliminate those passages by literary criticism the author considers to be illegitimate since there are such passages in St. Paul (e. g. II Cor. 5:10). By viewing these passages together with those which form the basis for Luther's theology, the author attempts to understand the profound concern of Luther's theology.

GESCHICHTE DER AUSBREITUNG DES CHRISTENTUMS [History of the Expansion of Christianity] By Kenneth Scott Latourette. "Theologie der Oekumene". Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. 482 pp. 19,20 DM.

This book is a translation and a condensation of the seven volumes of the author's History of the Expansion of Christianity which presents an immense amount of material hitherto unknown. To an even greater extent than the original, this abridged edition concentrates on the history of missions in the last four centuries; the period up to 1500 is compressed into the first 36 pages. There is a short survey on the time from 1944 to 1954, published only in the German edition which elucidates the basic attitude which is not always selfevident for Europeans. Looking to the whole, progress can also be recorded in these ten years. In spite of all defeats, Christianity was stronger in human affairs in 1954 than it was in 1944! The European reader receives an impression of an American description of an important part of church history, especially of the overseas observer's wide horizon. Surprising for European readers is the fact that the largest mission congregations in the 19th century grew up among the Europeans in North America where 5 to 10 percent were members of a church body.

DAS PRÄDESTINATIONSPROBLEM IN DER THEOLOGIE AUGUSTINS — Eine systematische - theologische Studie; [The Problem of Predestination in Augustine's Theology] By Gotthard Nygren. Studia Theologica Lundensia, No. 12. Lund: CWK Gleerups and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. 306 pp. Sw. Crs. 20.00.

This dissertation, recently presented to the Lund Theological Faculty, deals with a frequently discussed subject. It does not claim to produce new findings. It rather aims to "extend and to deepen the perspective, to improve the means of work and the methods of research and to increase scholarly self-criticism by constantly reviewing the results and the way the problems have been put". The headings show how the author proceeded: "The Augustinian para-Paulinistic Background", "The "Augustine's Starting point in the Philosophy of Religion", and "The Meaning of the Augustinian Paradox of Predestination". The author tries to prove that the problem of predestination is first to be found in Augustine, but not in St. Paul, because St. Paul's idea of predestination has "no destructive effect on the challenge of the proclamation for faith and action".

WAHRHAFTIGKEIT UND WAHRHEIT. [Veracity and truth.] By Christoph Senft. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. 1956, 171 pp. DM 17.20.

This work attempts to understand "liberal theology"-which has so often been brought into discredit in recent times-from its own presuppositions and from its own historical context. The author undertakes to investigate the tasks which it faced and what its own understanding of itself was. He proceeds from the hypothesis that even this theological work comes within the area of Christian theology. In this it is his intention to try to move away from a one-sidedly philosophical-anthropological formulation of the question and understand the men studied by him as Christian theologians within the church. From the complexity of philosophical thought in the nineteenth century the author picks out four series of problems,

and investigates in them four representatives of "liberal theology".

- The personal nature of faith (Schleiermacher),
- The historical nature of theology (Bauer),
- The exposition of Scripture (Hofmann),
   Faith as gift and act (Ritschl).

The author further establishes what all these four themes, for all their diversity, have in common. To this belongs above all the rejection of orthodoxy and its methods. "Liberal theology", he affirms, has explanations and insights that can stand firm and which forbid explaining them one-sidedly as arising out of the thought of the time, although one cannot deny that it has certain limitations. The work of liberal theology is characterized as "theological thinking in an historical sphere."

## Systematic Theology

BAKENFOR INFERNO [Beyond the inferno] By Sverre and Leiv Aalen. Oslo: Lutherstiftelsen, 1955. 104 pp. N.Crs. 11.80.

The background of this book is the discussion in the Norwegian press from 1953 to 1955 on the possibility of eternal damnation. A survey by Prof. Sverre Aalen on the biblical doctrine of hell (pp. 7-32, where the question is also discussed in how far the conception of hell is of extra-Christian origin), is followed by a chapter on "The dogma of hell and the confession of the church" by Prof. Leiv Aalen (pp. 33-72). A short section presents Luther's standpoint on the question (pp. 73-78). Twenty-four pages of carefully prepared footnotes provide a valuable aid to becoming acquainted with the positions of a whole series of significant theologians of more ancient and more recent times.

BIBEL - BEKÄNNELSE - ÄMBETE [Bible, confession, the ministry] By K. Barnekow, G. A. Danell and R. Ekström. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1955. 138 pages. Sw. Crs 6.50.

These three relevant essays are a witness to that theology in Sweden which one can best describe as "neoorthodox" and which is open to a high church orientation. Barnekow wants to see the orthodox doctrine of

inspiration reexamined and validated over against arguments of comparative religion, the historical and natural sciences and textual criticism. Revelation is a revelation in pictures (A. Farrer) and the Apostles are "artists" who when inspired created the pictures. The Church's confession, made relevant by the ecumenical movement and secularization, is defined by Danell. The great historical confessions are validated over against a false doctrine of creation (pure immanence), Christology (modern adoptianism) and ecclesiology (secularization). Ekström presents in 51 pages a thorough exegetical-systematic investigation of the offices (not the "office") in the NT. The later development is touched upon. From the fundamental fact of the Christian faith - i. e. "God became man" - he distinguishes between the call of the apostles and of the disciples. The two natures of Christ are presuppositions for the munus triplex which finds its continuation in the office of the apostle. The "general priesthood" (explained by way of Ex. 19) does not do away with the theological significance in principle of the particular priesthood. Though in the Reformation the prophetic office was strongly emphasized, this took place to the detriment of the other offices, including the diaconate. The office of the diaconate includes social, pedagogical and liturgical services and is the one place in the congregation where a woman need not be silent.

AKT UND SEIN [Act and Being]. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Theologische Bücherei, Vol. 5. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1956. 144 pp. DM 6.25.

This book, by the author who has become well known through his life work and activities during the church struggle in Germany, was first published in 1931. In a certain way it represents a continuation of his book Communio Sanctorum, re-published in 1955 in the same series, since both books deal with the right understanding of the church. Bonhoeffer first investigates how in philosophy life is understood and treated as either act or being. Then he applies the problem of act or being to the concept of God and revelation. From these studies he draws conclusions about the

Christian concept of being and the understanding of the church. The dialectic relation of act and being has its equivalent in the dialectic relation of faith and the church. The book closes with an anthropological study on "Being in Adam" and "Being in Christ". The whole work is, according to the author's words, "an attempt to unify the concerns of both genuine transcendentalism and genuine ontology within a framework of thought belonging to the church."

MACHT UND RECHT. Beiträge zur lutherischen Staatslehre der Gegenwart [Power and justice. Contributions to the Lutheran doctrine of the state today]. Edited by Hans Dombois and Erwin Wilkens. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1956. 201 pages. DM 14.85.

The questions raised by Bishop Berggrav's address on "State and Church Today: the Lutheran view" (Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, Hannover, 1952) were further pursued in three working conferences in 1953, 1954 and 1955 by the Evangelical Research Academy Christophorus-Stift (in Hemer, Westphalia), in collaboration with the Lutheran Church Office in Hannover. The present volume brings together the addresses given by theologians, lawyers and historians at these conferences. The contributions deal-mostly in indirect or direct discussion of the Berggrav address-with three sets of problems. 1. The question of the modern state founded on law and justice (Rechtsstaat) is dicussed from the point of view of the New Testament (Goppelt), historically (Scheuner, Nürnberger) and theologically (Trillhaas) and from the point of view of the history of thought (Dombois) -always in discussion and comparision with the traditional Lutheran doctrine of the state. 2. Two contributions are concerned with the question of the right of resistance in view of Luther's doctrine of justification (Schumann) and of authority (Klügel). 3. The last two addresses deal with the problems of the welfare state-which although they had become acute before Berggrav, have become even more so sinceas an historical and as a fundamental problem (Wilkens) and in a critical comparison with the charitable activity of the church (Weber). Also appended to the book are a "report" on the working conference

of 1955 (formulated by Hans Dombois) and the theses summarizing the first working conference of 1953.

DER CHRISTLICHE GLAUBE. Grundlinien der lutherischen Dogmatik [The Christian Faith—the fundamental lines of Lutheran dogmatics], third edition, newly revised and expanded by Ernst Kinder. By Werner Elert. Hamburg: Furche-Verlag, 1956. 575 pages. DM 36.00.

The text of the second edition of 1941, which has long been out of print, has been slightly altered or condensed only in those places where it served for clarification or where the late author's notes suggested it. The bibliographies have been expanded in accordance with the latest publications and the indexes brought up to date. The revised version of the first chapter, already begun by the author, has been added. It consists of a description of the present historical situation in which the theological task is set. Constantly concerned to demonstrate from Scripture, strongly taking into account the witness of the Reformation-particularly the Lutheran confessions-as well as frequently relating himself to the history of dogma and theology, the author succeeds in fulfilling the task described in the "Preliminary Questions". This task of dogmatics is continually to examine church dogma with regard to its adequate basis as the church also does in a genuinely scientific way, and then to present and champion, this "necessary content" ["Sollgehalt"] of the church's proclamation. The presentation follows in seven sections: man without the Gospel, who poses his questions from his central position, who is "religious" and "ethical" in all the nuances of these words; in other words man "under the law" can of himself come only as far as the Deus absconditus; only the Gospel allows the God revealed in Christ to be recognized in faith (1: Man's understanding of himself under the hidden God; 2: the foundation of the church's kerygma). At the head of all that can be said from this revelation there belongs the doctrine of the nature and work of the triune God (3: God himself). In addition to cosmology, seen under the dialectic of Law and Gospel, there is the doctrine of God's providence (4: God and

world). Following upon christology (the "kenosis" is understood as being by the Reconciler who became man!), the doctrine of the Lord's Supper finds its theological place: the Real Presence and the doctrine of ubiquity are only understandable in the light of the doctrine of the two natures of Christ (5: The atonement). Through the means of grace of the church the paraclesis of the Paraclete effects the renewal of man (6: The change in existence), which will find its perfection in "infinite freedom" when the possibilities of God can no longer be denied and no one will be able to cross them out (7: The last things).

OSTERGESCHEHEN UND OSTERBE-RICHTE [The Events and Accounts of Easter]. By Hans Grass. Göttingen: Verlag Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. 301 pages. DM 22.80.

In a thorough historical and critical examination of all the biblical Easter accounts, the author comes to the conclusion that only the certainty of the disciples in the living presence of the risen Christ can be regarded as the earliest strand of the biblical Easter faith. All the individual touches which tell more about the circumstances, (particularly the resurrection on the third day and the empty tomb) bear legendary marks. The author adopts the theory of an objective vision which says that in the events of Easter the disciples recognized the real but extramundane action of God in relation to Christ. It is demonstrated in great detail that the Pauline hope in the resurrection does not contradict this interpretation. For the systematic consideration of the "foundation of our Easter faith", which is the aim of the very detailed exegetical part, it is of the highest importance for the author that the Easter stories culminate in a word of the risen Christ. Accordingly our Easter faith is brought about not by reference to the authenticity of the individual Easter stories but by the proclamation of the Word of Christ. The fact that the "question of preaching on Easter texts" is broached in an appendix deserves special attention, since it shows that the author in spite of his radical application of the historical and critical method sees theology as being entirely based on proclamation.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By George Hendry. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956. 128 pp. \$ 2,50.

The author aims to clarify some of the controversial issues surrounding the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in recent theological thought. Defending the concept of the Holy Spirit as "the living action of God in the world", Hendry calls attention to some of the relationships between the Spirit on the one hand, and Christ, God, the church, the Word, and the human spirit, on the other.

RELIGIONSFILOSOFI [Philosophy of Religion]. By Søren Holm. Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag Arnold Busch, 1956. 483 pp. DKrs. 22.00.

After completing his two-volume (1100 pages) study on Religionsfilosofien i det tyvende aarhundrede (The Philosophy of Religion in the 20th Century), Dr. Holm, Professor in Copenhagen, now presents the principles of his own understanding of the philosophy of religion. For him it is a branch of philosophy which has the task of reviewing and if possible providing the validity of religious experience. Positive religions are accepted as given; their dogmatic content, however, is, strictly speaking, irrelevant for the investigation. Holm postulates the validity of a religious a priori as "the transcendental requirement for the existence of everything else". If religion has no validity, then all other forms of culture, such as art, ethics and science cannot claim any right of existence.

EKSISTENTIALISME OG KRISTENDOM [Existentialism and Christianity]. By E. Thestrup Pedersen. Copenhagen: Arnold Busch Forlag, 1956. 175 pp. DKrs. 12,75.

This book is based on a number of lectures presented by the author, a well-known Danish pastor; it deals with the relations between existentialism and Christianity. The first three chapters (58 pages) give a concentrated account of the main thoughts of existentialism and these chapters show that its greatest difficulties are in dealing with the second article of the Apostles' Creed, the confession to Christ the Lord.

The main section of the book (109 pages) provides a description of Dietrich Bonhoeffer's life and thought. According to the author's viewpoint, the theology and preaching of Bonhoeffer has, with the aid of existentialistic thinking, succeeded in giving new expression to the essence of the Gospel.

This study does not claim to be exclusively scientific but rather draws attention to a problem important for present-day church and theology. It is rich in interesting thoughts and observations.

RELIGIONSFILOSOFI [Philosophy of Religion]. By N. H. Søe. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Forlag, 1956. 279 pp.

Sharply opposing the concept of his colleague, Holm, Dr. Søe, Professor at Copenhagen University, maintains that the philosophy of religion must be a branch of theology. He rejects the idea that theology can be based on a philosophical foundation. In his understanding it is an error that for centuries such attempts were made. The struggle between faith and philosophy cannot be judged by reason, since Holy Scripture shows that the reason of the fallen man is blind. Søe's own concept of the philosophy of religion is based on the fact of God's revelation in Christ. In the introduction he refers to previous attempts toward a new approach to the philosophy of religion as carried forward by Emil Brunner and Roger Mehl, and he especially refers to the new foundation of theology as laid down by Karl Barth.

#### Practical Theology

DECLINE AND REVIVAL OF THE SOCIAL GOSPEL. By Paul A. Carter. New York: Cornell, 1956. 275 pp. \$ 3.75.

This study traces the development of American Protestant social consciousness from its early days to the beginnings of its broadening and theological ripening (1920—1940) via the church's experience with the ecumenical movement, pacifism, prohibition, the bitter lessons of the depression, fascism, and the second World War. The thesis is defended that the church should do more than redeem individual sinners, that it has a responsibility to work toward the

establishment of social conditions which conform more closely to "Christian ideals".

ER KOMMT AUCH NOCH HEUTE (Homiletische Auslegung der Alten Evangelien). [He comes even today—homiletic exposition of the Ancient Gospels]. By Martin Doerne. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. 163 pages. DM 8.40.

The author now presents his aids to sermon preparation in a fully revised fourth edition. At the beginning are in each case introductory exegetical remarks in regard to grammar and the history of interpretation. This leads to the homiletic exposition itself. It groups together the decisive pronouncements of the pericope, but leaves the way open for a concrete sermon: the foundation is laid, and the superstructure is to be determined by the situation of the congregation at the time. In addition the great individual seasons of the church year are introduced by means of a short meditation. The basis attitude of this homiletic exposition is well expressed by the title of the book, which is taken from the second verse of the Advent hymn of the Bohemian Brethren (Gottes Sohn ist gekommen -God's Son is come).

MANLIGT — KVINNLIGT — KYRKLIGT [Men and Women in Church Life]. By Berndt Gustavson. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1956. Sw.Cr. 12.00.

In this sociological and theological study the author investigates the position of women in Sweden's church life at the time of the structural change from a rural to an industrialized society. Cultural change in structure is always accompanied by a change in morals-this also applies to the life of the church. The woman was bound to the household-the theological foundation for this position had been given by Lutheran orthodoxy. As housewife and mother, she had her own dignity. Here were also her cultural, sociological and ecclesiastical functions and nowhere else. These ideas and the corresponding customs and functions were more and more pushed into the background and finally disappeared. This disappearance is a consequence of the cultural and sociological change in structure. In this framework the functions of the woman in the life of the

church and in worship have also disappeared. All these were consequences of industrialization and the discovery of the integrity of the individual. The author gives insight into church customs which are of interest to both church history and the study of folklore. He shows the significance of culture and of cultural changes for the life of the church. An English summary is attached.

DIE KIRCHE IN DER MODERNEN GE-SELLSCHAFT [The church in the modern society]. By Heinz-Dietrich Wendland. Hamburg: Furche Verlag, 1956. 247 pages. DM 14.80.

The author, who is both theologian and sociologist, is concerned to investigate from

a theological and sociological point of view the situation and responsibility of the church in the age of a mechanized mass society. Thus the questions regarding the relationship of the church to society in the present situation are placed in the focal point. This principal theme is discussed in general by means of a theological analysis of ecumenical study on social and ethical problems. It becomes clear that the problem of church and society is a world problem in which churches of all confessions and continents are involved. The book is addressed not only to the theologians but above all to all interested laymen as well, such as workers in church institutions, the evangelical academies and practical social service.

